

THE CHURCHES SEPARATED FROM ROME



Warygrove

EX LIBRIS





THE INTERNATIONAL CATHOLIC LIBRARY

Edited by Rev. J. WILHELM, D.D., Ph.D.

Joint Author of the Manual of Catholic Theology

-
- I. HISTORY OF THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.
By L'ABBÉ JACQUIER. Vol. I. ST. PAUL AND HIS EPISTLES.
Authorised translation from the 5th French Edition, by Rev.
JAMES DUGGAN. Price 7s. 6d.
 - II. HISTORY OF THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.
By L'ABBÉ JACQUIER. Vol. II. THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS. Autho-
rised translation from the French, by Rev. JAMES DUGGAN.
[In preparation.]
 - III. TEN LECTURES ON THE MARTYRS. By PAUL ALLARD.
With a Preface by MGR. PECHENARD, Rector of the Catholic
University of Paris. Authorised translation by LUIGI CAPPAD-
DELTA. Price 7s. 6d.
 - IV. THE CATHOLIC CHURCH. THE RENAISSANCE.
PROTESTANTISM. By ALFRED BAUDRILLART, Rector of the
Catholic Institute of Paris. Translated by Mrs. PHILIP GIBBS.
Price 7s. 6d.
 - V. THE BLIND SISTERS OF ST. PAUL. By MAURICE DE LA
SIZERANNE. Authorised translation by L. M. LEGGATT. With
Frontispiece, 7s. 6d.
 - VI. SURSUM CORDA. Letters of the Countess de Saint-Martial
in religion Sister Blanche, Sister of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul.
With Memoir by her brother, BARON LEOPOLD DE FISCHER.
Authorised translation from the French. With two portraits.
Demy 8vo, price 7s. 6d.
 - VII. MADAME LOUISE DE FRANCE. Authorised translation
from the French by META and MARY BROWN. With Illustrations.
Demy 8vo, price 6s.
 - VIII. THE GREAT SCHISM OF THE WEST. By L. SALEMBIER,
Professor at the Catholic University of Lille. Translated by M. D.
 - IX. CHURCHES SEPARATED FROM ROME. By L. DUCHESNE.
Authorised translation by A. H. MATHEW.
 - X. THE FINDING OF THE CROSS. Historical Researches by
LOUIS DE COMBES. Authorised translation by LUIGI CAPPADDELTA.
Price 6s.
 - XI. THE TEMPORAL SOVEREIGNTY OF THE POPES. By
MGR. L. DUCHESNE.

KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER, & CO. LTD.
DRYDEN HOUSE, GERRARD STREET, W.

THE INTERNATIONAL CATHOLIC LIBRARY

Edited by

REV. J. WILHELM, D.D., PH.D.

VOL. IX.

Nihil obstat

JOSEPH WILHELM, S.T.D.

Censor deputatus

Imprimi potest

GULIELMUS

EPISCOPUS ARINDELENSIS

Vicarius Generalis

Westmonasterii

die 5 Maii 1907

THE
CHURCHES SEPARATED
FROM ROME

BY

MGR. L. DUCHESNE

(DIRECTOR OF THE ÉCOLE FRANÇAISE AT ROME)

AUTHORISED TRANSLATION

FROM THE FRENCH BY

ARNOLD HARRIS MATHEW

(DE JURE EARL OF LANDAFF, OF THOMASTOWN, CO. TIPPERARY)

LONDON

KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER & CO. L^{TD}

DRYDEN HOUSE, GERRARD STREET, W.

1907

The rights of translation and of reproduction are reserved

Printed by BALLANTYNE, HANSON & Co.
At the Ballantyne Press, Edinburgh

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE

MGR. DUCHESNE is too well known and his erudition as an ecclesiastical historian is too universally recognised among scholars to make it necessary for me to introduce him to the readers of this volume.

I have to express my thanks to the Monsignor for his kind permission to translate this small but learned volume. I venture to offer it to the British public in the vernacular as a contribution towards the literature dealing with reunion of separated Christendom, at any rate of that portion of it which is in this island nearest in its constitution and liturgy to "the Mother and Mistress of all the Churches."

Should the labour of translation be rewarded by the favourable reception of one more of Monsignor Duchesne's works in this country, I shall be amply repaid for having undertaken it.

A wider and more accurate knowledge of the causes and results of the principal existing and the dying or already defunct schisms cannot fail to prove helpful to all who are anxious that the Divine prayer for ecclesiastical unity (St. John xxii.), may ere long find an echo in the heart of every one claiming the honoured title of Christian.

Ut omnes unum sint!

ARNOLD HARRIS MATHEW.

CHELSEFIELD, KENT, *May* 1907.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

VARIOUS circumstances have lately led me to study the position of those Churches which are actually separated from the communion of the See of Rome. Some of my works have already appeared before the public, recalling attention to events concerning old problems. Others, of a more serious character, have been written for special classes of readers. These works I am now amalgamating, hoping they may prove to be of interest at a time when the Holy See, faithful to its old traditions, is reminding the Christian world that schism has ever been a misfortune and unity ever a duty.

None need seek in this little book answers to the numerous questions raised by the admirable writings of His Holiness, Pope Leo XIII. But in it some light may perhaps be thrown upon the causes of certain separations, as well as upon the origin and titles of certain ecclesiastical self-governing bodies.

“Self-government” and “separation” are not synonymous terms. Although individualism has sometimes hindered the preservation of Christian unity, it would be a mistake to think that this unity is incompatible with legitimate diversity, and exclusive of all local organised life. Ecclesiastical centralisation, it cannot be repeated too emphatically, is not an ideal condition, but a means to an end. Under the stress of circumstances, the Roman Church, the one centre of Christian unity, has been

obliged to tighten and strengthen the bonds between herself and the churches confided to her care. But in less straitened times she formed, as her history abundantly proves, a different system of relationship between herself and them. Though, in this volume, I have only spoken of such autonomous systems as have degenerated into schism, it may be possible for me, later on, to study, in their turn, those which continue to exist without detriment to the unity of the Church.

It is upon the past that my searchlights flash, for in the Church no thought of the future can detach itself from her tradition. But I am not old-fashioned enough to believe that the future of Christianity depends upon the restoration of any former state of affairs, whatever such a restoration might have to recommend it. Neither am I conservative enough to believe that whatever *is*, must continue to be, indefinitely. St. Peter has no intention of casting anchor, nor of making his ship retrace her former course on the waters. *Duc in altum!* He steers with holy liberty, faithful the while to the word of Christ. Neither fear nor unexplored waters will stop him, nor will the protestations of archæologists bring him back to the shores whence he set forth as the fisher as well as the shepherd of men.

L. DUCHESNE.

CONTENTS

CHAP.	PAGE
I. THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND	1
II. THE EASTERN SCHISMS—	
1. THE NATIONAL CHURCHES EAST OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE	13
2. THE MONOPHYSITE SCHISMS	21
III. THE ENCYCLICAL OF THE PATRIARCH ANTHIMIOS .	40
IV. THE ROMAN CHURCH BEFORE THE TIME OF CONSTANTINE	76
V. THE GREEK CHURCH AND THE GREEK SCHISM .	109
VI. ECCLESIASTICAL ILLYRIA	154
VII. THE CHRISTIAN MISSIONS SOUTH OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE—	
1. THE SAHARA	180
2. NUBIA	183
3. AXOUM AND HIMYAR	190
4. THE ARABS	210
INDEX	221

THE CHURCHES SEPARATED FROM ROME

CHAPTER I THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

I

ORIGINS OF THE ANGLICAN CHURCH

ENGLAND is, of all the countries of the world, the one where ecclesiastical origin is most visibly connected with the Holy Apostolic See of Rome. Deep obscurity envelops the primitive times of the Churches of Africa, Spain, and France. In a celebrated letter, Pope Innocent I. declares that these countries received their first pastors from Rome, and that, at any rate, it is impossible to prove the contrary. No established fact can deny this positive assertion, while historical probability is in its favour. Details, however, are not forthcoming. Putting aside unauthorised legends, we have no documents relating to the first evangelisation of these countries. On the contrary, the history of the foundation of the English Church is known to us; firstly, by the writings of the Venerable Bede, a conscientious Anglo-Saxon historian, who possessed more knowledge than any of his contemporaries, and who wrote only one century after the first missions; secondly, by the original letters of Pope St. Gregory the Great and

his successors. We can scarcely demand more evidence than this.

The evangelisation of Germany is also clearly known. Like that of England, it was the result of pontifical solicitude. There is, however, this difference. In Germany the initiative is Anglo-Saxon and not Roman. The Popes intervened, doubtless, but only to further and direct a work undertaken by others than themselves. The Erwalds, Willibrords, and Bonifaces set themselves independently to their own tasks. At an early period, it is true, the two latter solicited the Roman patronage, which was most readily granted to them. But one cannot give to the Popes Sergius, or Gregory II., or Gregory III., or Zachary the title of "Apostle" of the Frisians or Teutons, whereas no Englishman will refuse to consider St. Gregory the Great as the Apostle of the English nation. It is to this great Pope that the honour reverts of having conceived and put into execution the project of evangelising the Anglo-Saxons, owing to his having sent across the Channel, missionaries, chosen from the circle of monks who were his intimate disciples. Who is there among the Christians of England who can approach without emotion the solitary avenues of the *Clivus Scauri* where the memory of this celebrated Pope still flourishes? Among those ruins of an ancient monastery, in that basilica, in those gardens and oratories, he seems to be gazing on the cradle of his religion—almost on that of his nation:—

*Ad Christum Anglos convertit pietate magistra
Adquirens fidei agmina gente nova.*

Thus was the conversion of England commemorated in the epitaph of St. Gregory. This triumph

of the "Consul of God" has never been contested.

Like all works of this kind, the English mission met with many difficulties. The first contingent of monks found their ranks diminishing. New missionaries had to be sent, new leaders especially, for labourers for the Lord's vineyard began to flock in from Ireland and France. It was Pope Vitalian who gave to the English Church its definite organisation in the person of Theodore. It was under the guidance of this great bishop that the elements composing evangelising communities were gathered together; that ecclesiastical formalism was arrested; that law, instruction, and the administration of religious rites were solidly established.

The Church of England was, then, a colony of the Church of Rome. This relationship was exhibited even in the architecture and the nomenclature of the churches. In the metropolitan town of Canterbury the principal church was called after the Lateran Church of Rome, *St. Saviour's*. At a little distance from it one finds, as in Rome, a church erected in honour of the Forty Martyrs. Beyond the walls of the town there was a church, named after the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul, which contained the tombs of the archbishops and kings of Kent. Canterbury was a miniature Rome; the English Church a daughter of the Church of Rome—perchance a better-loved one than those already in existence, certainly bearing a nearer resemblance to her and nestling closely under the maternal wings. Such, in rough outline, is undoubtedly the history of the origin of the Christian Church among the Anglo-Saxons. Such the starting-point of the great ecclesiastical development which produced, in the sixteenth

century, that Church upon which the so-called reforming experiments of Henry VIII., Edward VI., and Elizabeth were practised. Separated at length from unity with the Church of Rome, she has kept up her establishment and office as the "National Church of England." She may suppose, indeed, that the changes brought about in the sixteenth century have, from a Protestant point of view, re-established her in "primitive Christianity," but she cannot deny that her origin is other than what has been shown, and that her present attitude towards the Roman Church is peculiarly inexplicable. One is able to understand that Christian Churches which can claim apostolic founders such as St. John, St. Thomas, and St. Andrew may have a colourable excuse for claiming, from such a circumstance, a pretext for individualism, and that they boast of their antiquity and apostolical descent; but in England, historical evidence is clear. The English Church can claim to be apostolic only in so far as she is Roman.

II

I am aware that efforts have been made to avoid the consequences of this fact. I have read, with much benefit, remarkable works on Celtic Christianity, with which distinguished members of the Anglican clergy strive to connect the existing establishment. Their efforts to throw light on the history of ancient books, and on English and Irish customs, are much to be commended; but it would be chimerical to believe that they will ever draw from these studies any serious argument bearing on the present discussion. The English Church, it is true, succeeded a Celtic one in Great Britain. But the succession

was a purely material one. There was no bond of union between the two. The Hungarian Church of the eleventh century is established in the same country as the Pannonian Church of the fourth and fifth centuries. Can it be said, however, that the archbishoprics of Gran or Colocza have succeeded those of Guirinus of Siscia, of Irenæus or of Anemius of Sirmium? Can a succession be shown in ecclesiastical matters from the Church in the fifth century to the Church in the eleventh? Surely not. Between the old Latinised Christianity of the Danubian provinces and the Christianity propagated about the year 1000 among the newly arrived pagan Hungarians, there is identity of doctrine truly, but at the same time historical discontinuity. In England the situation is not less evident. The ancient British Church is not the mother of the Church of England—she is an older but an unfriendly sister. The situation is a well-recognised one. The conquering Anglo-Saxons drove those of the Christian population whom they did not slay westward. Teutonic paganism established itself in place of Roman Christianity in the dominion occupied by the conquerors. Neither the English authors, Gildas, nor Nennius, nor the Anglo-Saxon Bede have given any indication of the persistence of Christianity anywhere in the invaded territories. The documents treating of the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons only speak of the pagans and the Roman missionaries. No bishop, clerk, or layman appears in these recitals to cast even a shadow of the modern idea of a transmission or continuity, however slight, of British Christianity in England. Moreover, the Church of Britain is mentioned, indeed, but only as having formally and solemnly

refused to associate itself with the work of evangelising the pagan conquerors. The few British Christians who survived in Wales seem to have lived in dread of meeting their hated spoliators in heaven! They may be passed over. But once the Roman missionaries and the Irish monks had founded the English Church, a distinct and complete schism separated this new foundation from the old British one. This situation is too well known for it to be insisted upon here. I would only point to one fact. St. Chad had been appointed to the archbishopric of Northumbria at a moment when the episcopal See was vacant and the Anglo-Saxon Church was disorganised. His consecration was at Wessex, by Wini, an Anglo-Saxon bishop, assisted by two British bishops. In the trying position in which he found himself, Wini had thought he might appeal to the clergy of the neighbouring country. This act sufficed to produce the following result. The primate Theodore, having entered on his primatial duties, declared Chad's consecration to be null and void. Then, not wishing to lose the services of so capable an ecclesiastic, he actually re-ordained him for the Church of Mercia and the archbishopric of Lichfield.

Even in those days the validity of ordinations was discussed on principles evidently different from, and even more strict than those of the present day. In whatever way the change may be regarded, the re-ordination of St. Chad demonstrates the hostility of the relations between the British and the English Churches. But, it may be remarked, surely the Anglo-Saxon Church is Celtic—that is, Irish—if not British in her origin. No one is more desirous than I am not to diminish the importance of the part

played in Northumbria, and in other Anglo-Saxon kingdoms, by the saintly apostles of Lindisfarne. To the venerable figures of St. Aidan, St. Finian, St. Colman, and St. Cuthbert I yield deep and almost patriotic respect. I acknowledge their work for the evangelising of England after the time of St. Augustine and St. Paulinus. But can it possibly be denied that their efforts were entirely absorbed in the general movement emanating from Rome and Kent? It is impossible to admit that the English Church, definitely organised under the government of Theodore, with his chosen and accepted staff, ever saw in them her real directors. Zealous missionaries, renowned ascetics, preachers by their example even more than by their words, they have been, and always will be, venerated and invoked by the Christians of England. But from the very beginning the English were remarkable for that spirit of order which even now distinguishes their descendants. Between Irish enthusiasm and Roman discipline there was but brief hesitation. By the year 664 the Scottish rite had been abandoned in Northumbria, only thirty years after the arrival of the first Scottish missionaries. The primatial See of Canterbury represents the primitive Roman colony. The patrons of the other metropolitan See, that of York, are Paulinus, the Roman missionary, and Wilfrid, the ultramontane Englishman, to whom Theodore himself appeared to be the very essence of moderation.

III

The "bonds of union" between Celtic Christianity and the English Church can now be clearly seen. Need we probe further? Let us admit for

a moment, and for the sake of argument, that these "bonds" are historically proved, instead of being, as indeed they are, historically inadmissible. Let us look at that British Church from which, it is true, Irish Christianity was derived, through St. Patrick. What do we know of its history, and above all of its hierarchical rule? Little or nothing. Passing over the first three centuries of Christianity, of which the history of Britain gives us no account, we can only at the most trace back to a persecution anterior to that of Diocletian the martyrs mentioned by Gildas, St. Alban of Verulam, St. Aaron and St. Julian of Caerleon. In the fourth century three or four English dioceses were represented at the Council of Arles in 314; the English bishops protested, in 357, against the introduction of an Arian creed; many of them assisted, in 359, at the Council of Rimini, where, if they failed like the rest, they nevertheless gave great edification by their apostolic poverty and independence of character. In the fifth century, when the Roman authorities had left the island, Pelagianism, of which the author was a British monk, broke out in the country, and necessitated the sending of an orthodox legation. St. Germanus of Auxerre, designated by the bishops of Gaul, but delegated by Pope Celestine, arrived in Great Britain, and succeeded, during the course of two successive missions, in bringing back the British clergy to orthodoxy. Palladius, a British or Roman deacon, was ordained bishop by Pope Celestine, and sent by him to govern the converted Scots. In 455, the year in which the Paschal computation gave rise to special difficulties, the English Church, at the request of Pope Leo, altered the date which

had been previously fixed for the observance of Easter. And this is all, excepting of course legends, which, though ancient, are untrustworthy from the historian's point of view. Can any special independence towards the See of Rome be traced in this series of facts? Personally I observe in this meagre information several very distinct points to be noticed concerning the relations between the ancient British Church and the Apostolic See. The British bishops, together with the bishops of Constantine's empire, signed, in 314, the synodical letter addressed to Pope Sylvester, wherein the Pope figures, categorically, not only as the Chief Bishop of the West, but as the Superior of the whole western episcopacy. In the fifth century the Pope makes efforts to maintain the British Church in orthodoxy and to increase it by furthering the progress of the missionaries. He takes precise measures for both causes, delegating and authorising special persons. Bearing in mind the customs of these ancient times and the rarity of known facts, can we reasonably ask for further proofs? The Church of Great Britain resembled, in her relationship with Rome, the French and Spanish Churches, and, indeed, all the western Churches in union with the Holy See.

IV

This resemblance is willingly admitted, and in order to escape from having to acknowledge the Roman supremacy, refuge is taken by some in French tradition. It is, moreover, quite natural that the relationships of the Church of Britain should be found to be identical with those of the French

Church. Unless we accept the improbable legends on the evangelising of Great Britain by Joseph of Arimathea, or the accounts, not quite accurate, perhaps, but more authentic, of the relations between Pope Eleutherius and King Lucius, we must admit that Christianity was propagated, only by slow degrees, in those distant western regions, and that it was carried over from Gaul to England. These conditions of origin include the hierarchical conditions of the Church of Britain with that of Gaul; possibly the Church of Gaul may have been subordinate to that of Great Britain. Now, what do we know of the relations between the Gallic Church and the Church of Rome? Of the period before Constantine the Church of Gaul can produce only three documents, and no more. Two come from Lyons, the third from Africa, but this last presupposes other Lyonesse writings. The first document is a compendium of histories of the martyrs of the year 177, and partly emanating from them. The second is the literary work of St. Irenæus; the third is a letter [the sixty-eighth] of St. Cyprian, written at the instigation of Faustin, Bishop of Lyons.

“Nothing is better fitted than these writings for showing the close union which existed between Rome and the Churches of Gaul, notably those of Lyons and Arles. The martyrs of 177 are in correspondence with Pope Eleutherius; they write to him about the Montanists’ prophecies, calling him their Father, *Pater Eleutherius*, and recommending to him the bearer of the letter, the priest Irenæus, in terms which presuppose former relations and mutual esteem. As to St. Irenæus himself, connected as he was with the interior affairs of the Roman Church, he is perhaps, of all the Fathers, the one who has spoken most

strongly on the necessity of being in union with the Apostolic See. In the middle of the third century a letter of St. Cyprian proves the existence of this union; if any serious disorder arose in the Church of Gaul, care was taken that the Pope should be informed, the responsibility was considered to devolve upon him, and it was to him that the duty and the right were attributed of dismissing and replacing a bishop who had gone astray.”¹

The above facts are not new; the relations which they prove are very clear, and in no way appear to have been interpreted in a contrary sense to that which would naturally result from Roman origin in each case. We may then admit that, whatever were the national elements of which they were composed, the old Christian communities on Gallic soil considered themselves to be daughters of the Roman Church. Thus, even admitting the very problematical relationship with the British Church, the Anglican Church finds herself, from her most remote origin, in the same hierarchical position as the one so clearly deduced from the documents relating to her real foundation in the time of St. Gregory and under his care.

This situation is surely a very different one from that which results for the Church of France, in her present relations, or from that in which the schism of the sixteenth century found the Anglican Church. Between these two extremities of the chain there is what may be termed ecclesiastical centralisation. It would take too long to enter here on an examination of the history of this centralisation. Let us be satisfied with affirming that its development is easily traced to

¹ Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule*, vol. i. p. 87.

its source, and that if, in its successive stages, it shows great variety of form and intensity, it is inspired on the whole, throughout, with the same principles, and tends towards the same goal. Principles and end may be described in one word : *Unum sint*. Centralisation is the organisation of unity, and is also its safeguard. Now and again it has been reproached for narrowness and for over-minuteness. Like all institutions in this world, it is subject to abuses and to reform. If occasion for criticism presents itself, let us not forget the essential services it has rendered. Neither must we lose sight of the higher aims which are the goal of its existence. Unity is the church's ideal ; it is her distinctive mark in the Creed : *Credo in unam . . . Ecclesiam*. Whether we arrive by one or another path, the essential point is to attain to unity. Our one duty, then, is to maintain it.

CHAPTER II

THE EASTERN SCHISMS

I

THE NATIONAL CHURCHES EAST OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE

IN studying the origins of Christianity, the Roman Empire alone is usually taken into consideration. It was on its eastern frontier that Christianity was born, and the light of the Gospel moved westward, conquering those provinces subject to the Roman Empire. At all events, this is the principal feature of its progress dwelt upon by historians.

Nevertheless there were, outside the Roman Empire, important States bounding it on the east; first of all the Empire of Parthia, then the kingdoms of Armenia and Ethiopia. This latter kingdom, curious to relate, subsists, at the present day, much in the same condition as it was known to the contemporaries of Justinian. There is now neither a Roman emperor nor a king of Armenia known, save by a few coats of arms—the Shah of Persia is quite another being from the “King of Kings”; but there is still a Negus, a Christian king of Ethiopia, who may yet survive many centuries, although at this moment he has at his heels a nation both powerful and contemptuous of the antiquities of political rights.

Sooner or later all these kingdoms were reached

by the preaching of the Gospel. Christian centres were formed and grouped themselves into churches, practically, that is for all ordinary purposes, independent of the Byzantine Church. In Armenia and Ethiopia these Churches very soon acquired an official position. The sovereign became a Christian. As protector of the Church he concurred in the choice and direction of its principal representatives, in the same respects as in the Roman Empire.

In Persia it was otherwise. There, there was another official religion which would, without doubt, have ended in yielding to Christianity, without much violence, that place from which Islamism ultimately forced it; but in point of fact, as long as the Sassanide dynasty lasted, it remained the religion of King and State. Christianity was only tolerated.

But let us go more into detail, beginning with Persia.

The boundary between the Roman and the Parthian or Persian Empires crossed the Euphrates in an almost desert region, traversed only by nomadic Arabs. Towards the north, in the direction of the Tigris, it ran through a more thickly populated country of the Syriac tongue. Edessa was still, in the first century, the capital of a self-governing State, more or less a vassal of Rome, but in the third century it was incorporated into the provincial territory.

At Nineveh the boundary came under the dominion of the Iranian monarch. Between Edessa and Assyria the fortress of Nisibis changed masters several times. For a long period it belonged to the Romans, who, in 363, relinquished it to the Persians, and they retained possession of it.

To the west as well as to the east of the

frontier the same language was spoken, which facilitated religious intercourse. Edessa was won over to Christianity at an early date, and sent missionaries into the neighbouring countries, who, little by little, converted all the pagans on the banks of the Tigris, on the southern slopes of the tableland of Armenia, and in the fertile plains of Chaldea and Suzon. The Parthian kings seem not to have put a single obstacle in the way of this propaganda; their successors, who were Persians, from A.D. 226, were more strict in their attachment to "Mazdeism," but they still allowed the Christians to multiply and organise. However, about A.D. 340, war broke out between Persia and the now Christian Roman Empire. The faithful of the Armenian or frontier provinces, crossed by the routes of invasion, were suspected of being in league with the enemy. Persecution consequently broke out in its turn, and was both long and cruel. The King of Persia at that time was the famous Sapor II. Towards the middle of the following century there were troublous times, after which the relations between Church and State became tolerable. It was, it is true, forbidden to proselytise the Mazdeists; but, so long as the faithful addressed themselves only to pagans and Jews, they had not much to fear.

It was under these conditions that the Church in Persia was organised. From the beginning of the fourth century it was governed by numerous bishops, and, a little later on, this episcopate was divided into ecclesiastical provinces, governed by metropolitans, precisely after the manner established in the empire. The supreme head was bishop of the royal town of Aramenia, the double

city of Seleucia-Ctesiphon, to whom was given the Greek title "Catholicos," which signifies "Charge of all."

The Syriac territories of Assyria and Chaldea, with the mountainous dependencies of Kurdistan, were nearly, if not entirely, Christian. The faithful were less numerous in the eastern provinces of Media, Khorassan, and Persia, properly so called. Nevertheless, in all these countries there were bishoprics, extending even to the deserts of Turkestan and the oasis of Merv. The metropolitan of Persia had suffragans on both shores of the Persian Gulf, and even beyond it, in the islands of Socotra, Ceylon, and on the coasts of Malabar. These ramifications were, doubtless, more missions than Christian communities firmly established, and the same may be said of still farther distant affiliations in Tartary, and onwards into the very heart of China.

The dominion of the "Catholicos" of Seleucia was of no mean dimensions, and by the extension of his jurisdiction this high ecclesiastical dignitary figures in the same light as the greatest of the Byzantine Patriarchs. We might almost go farther and say that, inasmuch as we can compare the Persian Empire to the Roman, the Persian Church may be compared to the Church of the great western power.

Between these two branches of the Christian world the relations were of the easiest, united as they were by one faith, one morality, and the same general discipline, and governed by the same institutions; but communication was rare owing to political difficulties. There was nearly always a breach between the two empires, and when not actually fighting, they were usually preparing for war. The

Persian bishops hardly ever showed themselves at the Byzantine Councils, except in very exceptional cases. Nevertheless, the decisions of these Councils, and even the religious regulations of the Roman Emperors, entered into the ecclesiastical code of the Persian Church. They possessed the sentiment of unity, and expressed it as best they could.

These relations became troubled towards the end of the fifth century by theological disputes, of which I shall speak later on. Let us, first of all, say a word about the actual state of things. What remains now of this immense development? Very little indeed. Islamism overran the Persian Empire about the middle of the seventh century, and in the eighth and ninth the invasions of the Mongols completed the state of ruin, and the old religion of Zoroaster ended by being extirpated in the land of its birth; it no longer exists, save in the colonies of refugees, among the Parsees of Bombay. Christianity held out a little longer, and is now represented by the Nestorian or Chaldean communities of Kurdistan and Mesopotamia. The Chaldean Catholics represent those Christians of the ancient Persian Church who, in recent ages, have made their submission to the Holy See. The Nestorians are those who have remained in schism, or rather, who have reverted to it after an interval of union. They live amongst the Mussulmans of Kurdistan on the high mountains of Hakiari, and are in a state of semi-barbarism. Among them is to be found the traditional successor of the "Catholicos" of Seleucia, who, for some long time, has always adopted the name of Simon (Mar Schimoun) which has thus become a sort of title.

Outside these two colonies we must also mention

the important communities on the coast of Malabar, who are separated on the ground of doctrinal differences and heresy, but they are all the descendants of the ancient missions sent out from the Persian Empire in the sixth century, and even in the fourth, if not still earlier.

I said just now that Armenia had also its national Church, whose origins are very clearly explained by the legend of St. Gregory the Illuminator, but from a strict historical standpoint they are somewhat obscure. In any case, they do not seem to go back further than the time of Constantine, in whose family the movement began—every one was converted after the example of the sovereign, and organisation was thus made easy. Here, as in other places, the prevailing tongue was made the liturgical language, and the supreme direction of the Church was confided to a bishop-in-chief—a “Catholicos,” under whom were ranged the other prelates, distributed according to the circumscriptions of the different provinces. This hierarchy maintained its unity throughout the kingdom, and adapted itself to its boundaries. When, in 440, the Armenian kingdom disappeared, the Armenian Church was strong enough to survive it, and retain its nationality. The kingdom was divided between the two great neighbouring empires, and there arose a Roman and a Persian Armenia, but neither the Byzantine nor the Persian Churches benefited by this division. The Armenian bishops neither entered the fold of the Patriarch of Constantinople nor that of the Catholicos of Seleucia, but remained grouped around the national primate, despite the change of frontiers. And yet, at this time, no dogmatic differences existed. The ecclesiastical monophysitism was yet to come, the Persian Church was not yet

Nestorian. Nothing seemed to stand in the way of fusion, yet it did not take place. Furthermore, for the Greek colonies, which were founded in Roman Armenia, new bishoprics were formed, like that of Theodosiopolis (Erzeroum), dependent on the metropolitan of Cæsarea. In the Persian district Syriac bishoprics arose, attached to the metropolitan Sees of Adiabene or Media. Neither the Greeks of Pontus nor the Araminians of Mesopotamia found themselves at home in the Armenian Church. This seems to me a very remarkable circumstance, and one that is not appreciated as it ought to be. I need scarcely remind my readers that the Armenian Church still exists, full of life, counting its faithful by several millions, still grouped, at all events in theory, around the national primate, the Catholicos of Etchmiadzin. This residence, or at all events the canton in which it is situated, corresponds to the ancient capital. There were situated in ancient days the royal burghs of Artaxasa, Valarschapat and Dovin.

The isolation of the Church of Ethiopia is guaranteed by its geographical situation. Between Egypt and Abyssinia the distance is great, whilst the population is small and scattered. There were, without doubt, missions in these countries, but strangely enough, they came directly from Constantinople, and not from Egypt or Ethiopia. In this latter country the Gospel did not attain complete success—that is to say, the conversion of the monarch and the bulk of the nation—till about the beginning of the sixth century. The successful missions came from the patriarchate of Alexandria, to which also belonged the earlier attempts at missionary enterprise. This was the situation of the Church in the

East, before it was modified by the monophysite heresy. There were, within the Roman Empire, the four patriarchates, Constantinople (Thrace and Asia Minor), Antioch (Syria, Silicia, and Mesopotamia), Jerusalem (Palestine), and Alexandria (Egypt); outside the empire, the national Churches of Persia, Armenia, and Ethiopia. All these were united in one faith, and held more or less frequent intercourse with each other. They concurred, with the remembrance of their evangelisation, in maintaining exterior union, in so far as the difference of language and political events permitted.

It is well also to note here that in ancient times the divergencies of ritual were not very pronounced, and very little remarked, and the languages themselves offered no pretext for division. It took some time for the idea to become popular that the people had no need to understand the liturgical formulæ. Even in the empire itself, the liturgy was always celebrated in the language understood by the people. Thus, Coptic was used for liturgical purposes in Egypt, long before the schism of the sixth century. In Syria, sometimes Greek, sometimes Syriac was used. In the towns where several languages were spoken, Greek was the dominant liturgical language, but there were interpreters who translated the Lessons, the Homilies or the Prayers, either into Syriac, or even into Latin, where the Westerns were congregated in numbers. At the present time these questions of ritual and liturgical languages have assumed great importance, but the difficulties they give rise to are the result of the habits formed and cultivated during the Middle Ages; they are not closely connected with the formation of the ecclesiastical communities which we are now studying.

II

THE MONOPHYSITE SCHISMS

We know well how the Eastern Church in Byzantium was agitated by religious disputes, some of which introduced such profound differences as to create permanent schisms, dissentient churches, which continued to live outside the orthodox Church and in opposition to it. Time did not always overcome these parasitical organisations. The Arians, or Anomians, the Novatians, the Paulinists, and some other sects, disappeared, more or less rapidly, but it was not thus with the monophysite schism—it exists still; the points of dissent prepared in the fifth and acted on in the following centuries have more or less modified the religious equilibrium in the East, and they have lasted till our own time. They are always in schism. Why is this? The majority of the Nestorian, Coptic, Armenian, and Jacobite clergy would simply reply, “We are separated because we always have been so.” In the beginning they could have given a better reason to their orthodox adversaries; and this reason I am now going to try and explain, without going too deeply into metaphysics.

From all time, since the very foundation of Christian theology, there have been two ways of considering the divinity of Jesus Christ. Some have looked on Him as a man become God, and others as God become man; and first of all I must establish the fact that this second conception is the only orthodox conception, and if the first has, at various times, been maintained, it has always been by heretics, or imprudent persons. This theory introduced

into the Incarnation a kind of series of progressive stages, the steps of which were marked by the miraculous Birth of Christ, His Baptism, His Resurrection, and His Ascension. Jesus Christ was supposed to have become God by degrees. This idea has had several forms of expression, from Cerinthus down to Ibas of Edessa; and between these two we can count Hermas, Paul of Samosata, Diodorus of Tarsus, and Theodorus of Mopsuestia. But notwithstanding the different stages which circumstances created for it, the principle was the same; its right and true name is "Nestorianism." Nestorius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, constituted himself its interpreter and patron. The opposition which he met with was strong enough to banish him from his See in 431, and to send him into exile.

The other—the orthodox doctrine—which translates and develops the *Verbum caro factum est*, had need, in order to convey the true Christian idea, to be guarded from certain excessive consequences. Those who defended it had always experienced great difficulty in safeguarding the physical reality of the human nature in the sacred person of our Saviour. God becoming man, as it were, consumed the humanity which He associated with Himself, making it evanescent and, as it were, transforming it into a mere phantom.

Docetism, or the theology of the "apparent," but not real, Christ, flourished at Antioch in the earliest ages, and holds a front place in the Gnostic ideas of the Incarnation. In the fourth century the falsifier of the epistles of St. Ignatius was much occupied about it. Apollinarius disguised in a more complicated, and, on first sight, in a more satisfying manner, these same principles. According to him, Christ had

a human body and a sensitive human soul, but in place of the intellectual soul He had the nature of the Incarnate Word. By this a composite nature is produced, in which the divinity is most closely united to an incomplete humanity. This composition leaves little to be desired on the question of unity, but it is a "hybrid" being—Jesus Christ is *not* truly and really man; and on this point the tradition of the Church is assailed.

The celebrated St. Cyril of Alexandria took up this most difficult question. He certainly was tainted by the influence of Apollinarius, whose writings came under his notice without the name of their real author, and bearing the names of writers of good repute. It is not, however, less true, that his doctrine was formed under the influence of the true Christian tradition, and that if specific formulæ of his appear at first sight disquieting, it was always possible to give them a perfectly orthodox interpretation. However, this happy result was not to be attained till after more than a century of reflection and kindly efforts. Cyril is the great authority of the Monophysites, and also of the orthodox Christians, which proves that it is, and was always, possible to construe his meaning in the two senses.

In the affair of Nestorius, the Patriarch of Alexandria acted as the Syndic-general in the interests of orthodoxy, and in particular as the spokesman of the Pope. If we lay aside the violence, which was only to be expected after having aroused the Pharaoh of Christian Egypt, all must recognise that his triumph over Nestorius was ratified by the almost absolute unanimity of contemporary ecclesiastical opinion. Nevertheless, this opinion went no

further in its unanimity. It adopted Cyril, inasmuch as he represented the elimination of the anti-traditional and anti-religious doctrine of Theodorus of Mopsuestia and Nestorius, but it did not follow him so faithfully in his personal explanations, or rather particular formulæ.

The Cyril of the Council of Ephesus was the one they had kept in Rome, and whom they had brought to a reconciliation with the Syrians, who were more or less compromised by the heresy of Nestorius. But the Cyril of the Council of Alexandria, where he had promulgated twelve celebrated anathemas (*anathématismes*), was kept for long in quarantine.

At the Council of Chalcedon, in 451, this distinction revealed itself. The Council had been convoked on account of the excesses in doctrine, taught by a too advanced and erring follower of Cyril, the monk Eutyches, and by the conduct of the successor of Cyril, Dioscorus, Patriarch of Alexandria. Without hesitation Eutyches and Dioscorus were condemned, and if matters had gone no further, it is probable that religious peace would have been maintained in the East. Unfortunately, the situation of affairs seemed to demand the establishment of a new formula of faith. The imperial government, uncertain and flurried, having no guide for its conduct but the condemnation of persons, insisted that a symbol should be formulated.

But these disputes about mysteries are better arranged by silence than by definitions. When it becomes a question of adopting a positive and precise formula, peace is at once disturbed. We have only to read the official reports of this celebrated Council to see that it ended in outward unanimity, but

with a morally enforced acceptance of a definition which satisfied only a portion, and that a small portion, of the Greek episcopate. It was declared that in Christ there are two natures, but not two persons. This seems to be nothing new, and after events proved that, with a little goodwill, the differences could have been amicably settled. As it was, all those who were inspired by Cyril, and all who revered him as a master of theology, felt themselves injured and conquered. The Nestorians, who, up to this time, did not exist as a separate sect, who had no ecclesiastical organisation, and who merely represented a school, or theological tendency, were persuaded that they were aimed at. Undoubtedly, the name of Nestorius had been coupled with that of Eutyches in the list of condemned persons; but the formula issued did not displease his former allies, and they determined to make capital out of it, and hoped to do so easily. To help them in this work their two great chiefs had been somewhat too easily reinstated. Ibas and Theodoret were orthodox in manners and formulæ, but not in education or leanings. It was not so with the great doctor of their party, Theodore of Mopsuestia, whose name could not have been mentioned with praise, nor without blame. In fine, the Roman legates and the Emperor Marcion obtained, at the Council of Chalcedon, only a very doubtful victory. Without being aware of it, they had managed to wound to the quick the majority of the Greek theologians, and, with them, a vast number of religiously-minded people who thought, or rather felt, with Cyril and his party in these questions. Cyril may have employed expressions that were too severe, or not well balanced; but, in reality, his passion for the unity of Christ

clung to the very fibres of the Eastern mystic's nature. For a disciple of Theodorus of Mopsuestia, as for a disciple of Pelagius, the question of the relations between man and God is, more than anything else, a question of merit and demerit. In the great book of "Retribution" each one has his account in two columns, owing and owed. By accumulating merits and diminishing faults, the condition of the soul is improved. The operation finished, God strikes the balance, and classes one according to the excess of the active over the passive. Now this is pure morality; it is not religion. What is the place of the Incarnation or of the Cross in this system? Jesus Christ is a model, nothing more. He is not the true Saviour, the real Redeemer, who by His divine presence purifies all, elevates all, consecrates all, and makes of us divine beings, in as far as our limited nature does not obstruct this communication of the Divinity to us. Very different is the spirit which animates the theology of St. Cyril. Jesus Christ is truly God in us. The Christian is in direct contact with Him by a physical union, though at the same time a mysterious one, under the sacramental veil of the Holy Eucharist. By this Body and Blood the Christian arrives at union with God, because in Jesus Christ he has an equally physical union with the Divinity. Plotinus, another teacher of Alexandria, had also imagined that he could attain to absolute contact with the Divinity, but only by asceticism and ecstasy.

But Cyril permitted the poor labourer in the Delta, or the unknown workman of the Pharos, to touch God, even in this world, without ecstasy or extraordinary asceticism, and to ensure for himself by this means a sort of mystical relationship, from which

devolved sure guarantees for the future—and not only guarantees of immortality, but of glory. Place these two mysticisms, or, rather, this mysticism and rationalism, side by side, and say to which of them religious souls should lean. At Chalcedon they had enforced theology, as it were, by police regulations, but they had not united the hearts of the dissentients. Hearts, true hearts, are not happy unless they are gratified. Rome is the seat of government, not the home of theology, nor the paradise of mysticism. The Greek Empire did not trouble itself about these two latter powers unless they raised a storm. The diplomatic instrument of Chalcedon, which was, all the same, but a Greek version of a Latin letter of St. Leo's, was raised to the status of *regula fidei*—a rule of faith. Nevertheless there were loud protestations in the East, at Antioch, at Jerusalem, and above all at Alexandria; and as these protestations took the form of bloodshed and strife, the empire was forced to interfere. It triumphed in Jerusalem, it compromised at Antioch, but at Alexandria the populace was completely successful in its movement, and forced the agents of the government to retire. Thirty years after the Council of Chalcedon they had to use every endeavour to retire gracefully and “save their face,” as the Chinese saying goes. For this purpose the Henotikon was invented, an imperial edict addressed to the Egyptians in 482, the most pointed declarations of St. Cyril were placed on the canon, and anything that had been said, either at Chalcedon or elsewhere, was repudiated. The Patriarch of Constantinople, Acacius, patronised this arrangement.

It was, in reality, the renunciation of the Council and of the “tome” of St. Leo, a repudiation well

dissimulated, and covered by a silence which, with a little goodwill, could have been qualified as respectful. This combination was most displeasing to Rome. The emperor was not addressed personally; it was the Patriarch Acacius who was held to be responsible. Things went so far that Pope Felix III. pronounced sentence of deposition against him, and, as the entire Greek Church sided with Acacius and supported the Henotikon, a frightful schism (*schisma nefarium*) once more, and, alas! not for the last time, divided the Roman Empire into two hostile communities.

Left to itself the Byzantine Church soon became a prey to domestic troubles. The majority of the faithful held to the Henotikon, interpreted in the sense that the theology of Cyril had triumphed absolutely, and with regard to the formulæ and reconstructions promulgated at Chalcedon, they reconciled them as best they could with Cyrillian orthodoxy. But there were numerous fanatics, especially in Egypt, and in the monasteries of Syriac Syria, to whom this conciliation seemed not only impossible but monstrous. According to the leaders of this movement it was not silence that was becoming, it was protestation. The Council of Chalcedon and Nestorianism were identical; to distinguish between them was folly. A true Christian, a faithful bishop, a monk worthy of the name, could be nothing less than a fierce adversary of this accursed Council, and of its instigator, Pope Leo. Thus the Henotikon was variously interpreted without interference, so long as it preserved the official status given to it by the Emperor Zeno.

Anastasius, Zeno's successor, was markedly favourable to the extreme interpretation most ad-

verse to the Council. It was by his means that, in 512, Severus was installed as Patriarch of Antioch. He was an ultra Cyrillian, exaggerated in his views, severe in his government, harsh and powerful in oratory. Syria, already much agitated during the intermittent episcopate of Peter the Fuller, for the most part succumbed to monophysitism. In Egypt this doctrine was ostensibly the law, whatever may have been the attitude of the secular authority.

In 518 the Emperor Anastasius died, and his successor, Justin, forthwith changed the direction of religious government. The wind which had blown him into power came from Rome and the imperial countries, where the Council of Chalcedon was respected. Severus, and the other monophysite leaders in the East and in Asia Minor, were deprived of their Sees, and fled to Egypt, a refuge open to the followers of "Cyrillian orthodoxy." Communion was re-established with the Holy See and the Latin Church. But to make arrangements in Constantinople was one thing, to carry them out in the Eastern provinces quite another.

We do not know what took place in Egypt; what is certain is that the Council of Chalcedon was not then proclaimed there. In Syria, after several efforts and much prudence, all of the anti-Chalcedonian bishops were got rid of, but the majority of the monks still resisted, and allowed themselves to be turned out of their monasteries rather than accept the imperial decrees.

The troublous times continued from 520 till the accession of Justinian in 527. Justin, the predecessor of Justinian, seems to have accepted no compromise. It was necessary to acknowledge the Council, or to become an outlaw. Justinian ascended

the throne with orthodox principles ; he made no pretence of abandoning or of falsifying the Council's decrees, but he lent a willing ear to interpretations of them, which reduced them to the level of Cyrillian theology. As a matter of fact, Cyril had been exaggeratedly represented as a martyr. At Rome he had not been so much as spoken of for a hundred years, save when, by necessity, the Council of Ephesus and its preliminaries were mentioned. Many of the Popes had had occasion to write on this subject, and it is easy to see, from their letters, that they avoided speaking of Cyril, and above all that they never mentioned the famous synodal epistle, wherein were contained the twelve Anathemas—that is to say, the most important writings of the great doctor on the question of the Incarnation.

Pope Gelasius wrote a whole treatise on this subject, in which he gathered together all the opinions of the Fathers, especially of the Greek Fathers, but he made not the smallest allusion to the works of St. Cyril. This system of ignoring the Saint was truly formidable. Add to this the fact that the Popes also patronised the monastery of the Acemites in Constantinople, which was a hot-bed of Nestorianism, where they did not shrink from fabricating false documents in favour of the theology of Mopsuestia. Under these conditions, we cannot be surprised if people of good faith found some difficulty in accepting the Council of Chalcedon, and in considering its defenders as perfectly orthodox. Explanation was necessary to demonstrate that the formula of 451 was not a passport given to a system of theology already crushed by St. Cyril. It was necessary to interpret this formula

according to the Cyrillian idea, and to free it from the Nestorian interpretation; in other words, it was necessary to reconcile the orthodoxy of Leo with that of Cyril.

This is what was finally obtained by insisting that the Pope should admit a new formula, patronised in the East by the best and most peaceful of the Cyrillians.

At Rome there had, at first, been some hesitation with regard to the acceptance of the text *Unus de Trinitate passus est in carne*, but in the end it was finally decided that it was really orthodox. We must add that it is far less obscure than the expression of St. Cyril: *Una natura Dei Verbi incarnata*, or that of the Patriarch Severus: *Una natura Dei Verbi incarnati*. Here the unity of person is stated, not the unity of nature. It is, to say the least, an equivocal expression, and one that could never pass muster without explanation.

The new formula was solemnly promulgated and inserted, with the principal documents concerning it, at the head of the Justinian code. The emperor also brought about the holding of conferences between the leaders of the opposition and several orthodox bishops. The satisfaction claimed for a long time by the anti-Chalcedonians was at last granted to them, somewhat tardily it must be owned. This was the condemnation of the memory of Theodore of Mopsuestia, the proscription of his writings, and of all that was anti-Cyrillian, in the writings of Theodoret and Ibas.

These measures had some effect on public opinion, but all did not allow themselves to be convinced. The opposition was still kept up in certain circles in Constantinople, and in some towns

of the dioceses of Asia, but above all in the patriarchates of Antioch and Alexandria. The dissentients banded together, refused the sacraments of the official church, and had recourse to the ministrations of proscribed priests. The government ended by fearing that a schism was in progress.

Justinian having a strong arm, and conscious of having neglected no conciliatory measures, thought himself bound to resort to practical precautions. Those of the bishops who refused to adhere to the Council of Chalcedon were not only banished from their Sees, but arrested, and imprisoned in monasteries, under strict surveillance. The object of this step was to prevent the formation of a nonconformist hierarchy: without bishops there could be no ordinations, and without ordinations there would be no dissentient priests. It was about the year 536 that this system was inaugurated, and it was extended to Egypt, where there were but few orthodox believers. The Patriarch Theodosius was removed to Constantinople with many other bishops. But, in spite of everything, some remained who retained both their views and their Sees, either because the agents of the State prevaricated, and sent in false optimistic reports, or because some of the prelates signed contrary to their consciences.

In Syria the success was more complete. Here the monophysite party, strong in their resolution not to hold communion with orthodox priests, saw with dismay the thinning of the ranks of the dissentient clergy. But they were saved from destruction by two combined well-wishers—the Ghassanic Emir, Arethas, and the Empress Theodora.

The Empress Theodora had always been full of tenderness for the Monophysites, whose passions, if

not their doctrines also, she shared. She was unable to protect them officially, but contrived to do so secretly. The Emir Arethas, on the other hand, had been, since 531, invested with the military governorship of the eastern provinces of Syria, precisely those in which Syriac was spoken, and where the opposition to the confession of faith numbered most of its adherents. During a journey to Constantinople he came to an understanding with the Empress Theodora for the appointment of a schismatic bishop; he seems even to have asked for two—one for himself and one for the Arabs of the Persian Empire, of which the political capital was Hertha, or Hira, to the south of ancient Babylon.

There was no lack of monophysite bishops in Constantinople, but being in prison they were not available. However, two monks were found deeply imbued with the heresy, and well able to endure poverty and hardship. Having been secretly consecrated bishops, by prelates who were either in prison or in hiding, they were sent forth on their mission. One was named Theodorus, and was appointed to occupy the See of Hira; it is unknown whether he reached his destination or not. The other, James (Jacobus), surnamed Baradaïus, gave his name to the Jacobites, and this was the origin of the Jacobite Church. James reached the States bordering on the Euphrates; but, although he had been given the title of Bishop of Edessa, he could not take up his abode in that important city as the police would have raised difficulties. He was perpetually on the move, going from one village to another; misleading his pursuers by his rags, his poverty, and the rapidity of his migrations. Before long, a goodly number of his priests were

found in the monophysite localities. But bishops were needed. For episcopal consecrations, three bishops were necessary. James found two monks, who were both resolute and well-instructed, and, going to Constantinople, sought for letters of recommendation from the Patriarch Theodosius. Accompanied by his two candidates, he journeyed into Egypt, where, as I said before, it was easy to find prelates ready to take the risk of such proceedings.

The three bishops returned into Syria, where they chose, out of the monasteries near the Euphrates, monks who accepted the imaginary titles of Bishops of Laodicea, Mabourg, Seleucia, &c. Hands were imposed on them, and thus, having constituted a staff of suffragans, they proceeded to elect the Patriarch. Choice fell upon a certain Sergius, for a long time the intimate companion of James Baradaïus, by whom he was consecrated, the others assisting.

Such was the organisation of the Jacobite patriarchate of Syria. The chief took the title of Patriarch of Antioch, a city where it was impossible for him to reside; the others reconstructed, by their titles, the original framework of the orthodox patriarchate. But they were not satisfied to rest there. Besides the patriarchate of Antioch, which was imperial ground, they desired to have a "Catholicos" for the Persian Empire. This they achieved with some difficulty, as monophysitism was looked upon with disfavour beyond the frontier; but they did succeed finally. Even at this present time we can distinguish the jurisdiction of the Jacobite Patriarch and that of the "Maphrian." The former is the representative of the Patriarch of Antioch; the other is a phantom of the "Catholicos." Neither the one

nor the other, as we see, represents a national Church, like those of Persia, Armenia, or Ethiopia. Both are schismatics, the first from the Byzantine Church, the latter from the Church in Persia. In Egypt things had fallen much into the same lines. The Patriarch Theodosius, from the depths of his exile, was still considered as the legitimate head of the Church. There was, no doubt, an official Patriarch at Alexandria, and the provincial episcopate was supposed to obey him. In reality, behind this visible episcopate, there was another. If death made vacancies, it was not difficult to fill them up. Theodosius survived Justinian; and a few years after his death, the Egyptians contrived to obtain for themselves a Patriarch, no longer buried in a distant monastery, but living in Alexandria or its environs.

According to this arrangement Egypt possessed two Patriarchs and two hierarchies. The dissentients called themselves "Copts," that is to say, Egyptians; and they bestowed on the others the nickname of "Melchites," or imperialists, which ever after clung to them.

The patriarchate of Jerusalem escaped this disunion, as did also that of Constantinople. A few monophysite bishoprics had been established by James Baradaïus, but they do not seem to have survived, even to the end of the sixth century. Altogether in the empire, therefore, there were, in opposition to the four orthodox Patriarchs, only two unorthodox, those of Antioch and Alexandria. These were not subject one to the other, but contented themselves with keeping up communion with each other, interrupted, however, by numerous disputes. Beyond the empire, these theological differ-

ences created much commotion, but were unable, except in Persia, to bring about internal schisms.

The Church of Ethiopia had been founded by monophysite monks, who came into Egypt at the time of the Henotikon—that is to say, when the Copts and Melchites were still united. The schism once founded, the Ethiopians naturally joined the religion taught by their masters, and went over to the Coptic Patriarch in a body. In Armenia, there seem to have been greater complications, and the facts have not even yet been brought clearly to light. Before the Council of Chalcedon, the Cyrillian tendency was strongly represented in this country, and people easily rallied to the opposition, which the Council raised in the eastern provinces of the empire, and which showed itself clearly under the Emperors Zeno and Anastasius. On the other hand, Nestorianism crept into the Persian Church towards the end of the fifth century.

The Armenians, at this time harassed by the Sassanide kings, naturally inclined towards those doctrines and rites which would distinguish them from the Christians of the oppressing State, and in repudiating the Council, they drew nearer to the Romans. Later on, in 519, when the wind had changed at Constantinople, and the decrees of the Council were imposed instead of being disputed, it was too late. The Armenians remained Monophysites; it was in vain that, time after time, the Byzantines tried to induce them to follow their lead: they conformed sometimes, exteriorly or partially, but always reverted to their schism.

There were moments when the missions of the heretical Julianists, or Eutychians, seemed to gain a considerable following among them, but at heart,

and as a whole, the Armenians remained on the same level as the Monophysites of Egypt and Syria. When James Baradaïus founded his schism, they did not refuse him their support.

What they most of all clung to was the preservation of their individuality, and to raise up, by means of their religion, barriers for the defence of their nationality. They succeeded in this, partly by dogma, but above all by ritual, such as the prohibition of the mixed chalice, the use of leavened bread, the combination of the feasts of Christmas and the Epiphany, and other peculiarities of this nature.

The Church in Persia had taken no part in the Council of Chalcedon. I have already said that, although the Council condemned Nestorius, it was not badly thought of by some of his former allies. Indeed two of them, Ibas of Edessa and Theodoret, had been solemnly reinstated by it. But they and their followers continued to cultivate the opinions of Theodore of Mopsuestia, to the great scandal of the Cyrillians. Edessa the Holy contained one of the principal nests of this movement, the body known as the "School of the Persians," with Ibas as its leader. At the time of Zeno it was directed by a master of the name of Barsumas. Teaching of this nature became absolutely intolerable under the régime of the Henotikon. The government came to an understanding with the bishop, Cyrus, and the school was abolished and its members dispersed in 489.

The frontier was not far distant, and Nisibis received the refugees, and there Barsumas rallied them. The clergy of the Persian Church were more in sympathy with the doctors of Antioch, Diodorus,

Theodorus, Ibas, and Theodoret, than with the Alexandrians. The disciples of Barsumas, for the most part of a very bellicose nature, were not slow in making their ascendancy felt.

The King of Persia could not but view with a favourable eye the dogmatic barrier about to be raised on his western frontier. A few years after the arrival of Barsumas, the ecclesiastical authorities, with the Catholicos at their head, were won over to the new doctrines; Barsumas was given the metropolitan bishopric of Nisibis, his friends were installed in other important Sees, and the Persian Church became Nestorian.

It was sixty years since the condemnation of Nestorius. His party which, up to that time, had been nothing more than a theological group, became, towards the end of the fifth century, a great national Church. Such were the consequences of the Henotikon of Zeno. Henotikon signifies an edict of union, and we see how far the name corresponds with the reality. Schisms in two patriarchates out of four, nonconformist organisations everywhere, ecclesiastical plague-spots, of the gravity of which we can judge, when Mahomet appears on the horizon;—outside the empire the three national Churches of Persia, Armenia, and Ethiopia separated from Catholic unity, and lying in schism and heresy. How much better inspired would the actors in this drama have been, if, instead of philosophising so much over the terminology, instead of disputing about the physical union, or the hypostatic union,—the two natures which form but one person, or the sole hypostasis which rules the two natures,—they had been a little more preoccupied about things less sublime but far more vital in their consequences.

Whilst fighting to the death about the unity of Christ, which is a mystery, they sacrificed the unity of the Church, which it was their bounden duty to uphold.

In 362, immediately after the Arian crisis, Athanasius returned from exile, and gathered round him the remains of the orthodox episcopacy, but these confessors began at once to dispute. Some contended that there was but one person in God, the others held that there were three. The great bishop listened patiently to them, and then delivered a judgment worthy of Solomon: "I see well that your terms differ, but that in reality you believe the same thing; you can therefore give the right hand of fellowship to one another." Whereupon they embraced each other.

Why, before it was too late, was there not found a man of noble heart as well as of great judgment, to speak in such language to these two parties, who, both firmly believing in the unity of Christ, yet came to grief at the Council of Chalcedon? With all their goodwill neither the Emperor Marcion in the fifth century, nor Justinian in the century following, had the necessary authority. On the vast horizon of the Christological controversy we see many clever men, many distinguished theologians, but there is no Athanasius.

It is for this reason that the Eastern schisms still exist, and that they present us with such difficult problems. But we may well believe that these problems are much more in need of our charity, and of our love of peace, than of our theological erudition.

CHAPTER III

THE ENCYCLICAL OF THE PATRIARCH ANTHIMIUS

IN his encyclical *Præclara*, addressed on June 20, 1894, to "Princes and Peoples," his Holiness Pope Leo XIII. spoke first of the East, "from whence salvation spread over the whole universe." The Sovereign Pontiff said to the Orientals how deeply he regretted to see prolonged the lamentable schism which separated them from us, and for such trivial reasons. He insisted on the necessity of ecclesiastical unity; he said that this unity must be a real unity, but that it was possible to reconcile it with diversities of ritual and traditional privileges.

To these advances of the Holy Father, a reply was made by the Patriarch of Constantinople and his Synod. This letter¹ furnishes evidence of a spirit which, I knew, animated some of the inferior classes of people in the Greek Church, but which I could never have believed it possible to see placed on record in a document of such importance. On the other hand, it seems to me that Church history in those parts must be very much below the level we are accustomed to, in our own schools, thanks to the researches of modern erudition. Nor is it less evident that, even in the highest ecclesiastical spheres of the Greek Church, faith in the absolute necessity for

¹ I refer to the Greek text, which appeared in the *Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ Ἀλήθεια* of 29 September (October xi, 1895).

visible union between the different branches of the Christian family is not so strong as with us. I should therefore like, while on the subject of this patriarchal letter, to return to the subject of the Greek schism, very old in its remote beginnings, but full of actuality in the problems that it puts before us.

I will, first of all, notice this new manifesto of the Greek Church, and then I will show what are the most ancient traditions of the relations between the Holy See and the whole of Christianity; and, finally, I shall endeavour to show how the Greek Church constituted her autonomy, and how by the development of her particularism she finally broke away from the unity of Christianity.

I

I have first to complain of the general tone of this patriarchal and synodal encyclical.¹

Its authors, the Patriarch and the twelve bishops of his Synod, had to reply to a more than paternal exhortation. It is impossible to conceive words sweeter or more amicable than those contained in the letter *Præclara*. The Holy Father had put all his heart into it; I might almost say, he had put only his heart into it. Not one mortifying expression, not a single word of reproach, not a grievance spoken of with that precision which it is so difficult to separate from bitterness, do we find therein. What then did they discover to offer to him in reply? Insults—from the very first words!

¹ The document is signed after the Patriarch by the Bishops of Cyzicus, Nicomedia, Nice, Broussa, Smyrna, Philadelphia, Lemnos, Durazzo, Bera, Allassona, Carpathos, and Eleutheropolis.

They hastened to declare that "the devil had inspired the Bishops of Rome with an intolerable pride, from which arose innumerable impious innovations, contrary to the Gospels." A little farther on they accused him of claiming, not only the spiritual supremacy, but likewise the temporal supremacy over the whole Church, and of calling himself the sole representative of Christ on earth, and of being the dispenser of all graces. Not only do they refuse the embrace of his outstretched arms, but they make him clearly understand that he has reversed the order of things, and that, if he desires reunion, he must first of all retract all that he and his predecessors have introduced, as "innovations," into the tradition of the Church. This retraction, they say, is claimed by "the one Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church" — the Church of the Seven Œcumenical Councils. She it is who draws up the programme, in terms of a harsh and dry solemnity.

We are well acquainted with this programme, for it is not by any means the first time that a similar answer has been made to the exhortations of the Roman Church. But it might have been hoped that friendly reasoning, such as Pope Leo's, might have produced some impression, and above all, that, in the present state of Christendom, the East would have felt, like the West, the little relative importance of the particular details against which they have been running their heads for a thousand years. For in truth, for the most part, they are details, trivial matters, which a sarcastic writer might easily term sacristy questions: a word inserted in the Latin Symbol without a previous consultation with the Greek Church; unleavened substituted for leavened bread; the exclusive importance accorded at the

consecration to the words of our Lord, "This is My Body," &c.—the lay communion under one species; baptism by affusion. The objections to Purgatory, the Immaculate Conception, and the Papal Infallibility, appear more serious, and they would have done well to confine themselves to these instead of confusing them with the other difficulties.

I am ready to admit that on all these heads they believe themselves to be in the right. But what follows? Is this conviction an obstacle to reunion, or at all events to the preliminaries of an understanding, or to the efforts to arrive at such an understanding? They say that they desire reunion and that they pray for its realisation. Is reunion best arrived at by thrusting forward all that can cause separation, and keeping in the background all that could tend to conciliation? Is the following the kind of style to help on such a reunion: "Our orthodox Church is prepared to welcome the proposal for reunion, on the understanding that the Bishop of Rome, once for all, rejects the many and various novelties introduced into his Church contrary to the Gospels—innovations which were the origin of the lamentable separation of the Eastern and Western Churches—and provided that he puts himself under the rule of the seven Holy Œcumenical Councils"?

It would be impossible to use more haughty terms to signify their ultimatum of non-acceptance. We have to deal with an offended people, who wish to have nothing to do with us, and tell us so without any hesitation. But why are they offended? Is the language of the Pope new? Are they not accustomed to hear it? Have they any fresh grudge against him? Yes, they have one, and I find it a

few lines farther down than those I have just quoted. "The papistical Church" (what a polite epithet!) "forsaking the ways of persuasion and discussion, has for some time been sending into the East men whom St. Paul calls 'perfidious labourers, who disguise themselves as apostles of Christ.'" Who are these obnoxious beings? "They are clergy who, adopting the costume and wearing the head-dress of the orthodox priests, make use of many other deceits to proselytise."

It appears that lately there were to be seen, in Constantinople, at Smyrna, and elsewhere, either Melchite priests, or other uniates, from Syria, or even, perhaps, they may have been some Basilian monks from Italy. Naturally, they wore their "kamelafkias" and their long flowing robes. This is their habitual garb. Because they are not disguised as Latin priests, or as English tourists, it cannot be alleged against them that they are as wolves in sheep's clothing. Is it worth while to be disturbed by such trifles?

And yet it was this childish incident which gave us the patriarchal encyclical, as his Beatitude Anthimius expressly declares. Of the encyclical of the Pope he took no heed; he even disdained to read it:—"We have kept silence till this moment, we have disdained even to cast our eyes on this papal encyclical, considering it useless to speak to those who are deaf." But "kamelafkias" had been seen going about the East, which did not cover orthodox heads. From that moment they decided to overcome their repugnances; the Phanar condescended to grant an audience to the Vatican. They cast their eyes on the encyclical, and a solemn *ecthesis* was drawn up, containing eight articles,

destined to prove to others as well as to themselves that they were not at fault in even refusing to hear reunion mentioned. Let us now consider this document.

II

Each of the articles is drawn up in this form: "The Church of the seven Œcumenical Synods, one, holy, catholic, and apostolic, believes and professes that" . . . "The papal Church on the contrary," &c.

Let us first speak of this formula. They reproach us with having added one word to the Creed; but I maintain that here they add a fifth characteristic mark to the four by which the Symbol defines the true Church. The Church is not only one, holy, catholic, and apostolic; she is also the Church of the seven Œcumenical Synods. Wherefore do they add this qualification? Is there anywhere in the Gospels, or in the Apocalypse, a prescription in virtue of which the future Church might, or was to, qualify herself thus? Did the seventh Œcumenical Council shut the door after itself, prohibit all other similar assemblies, prescribe that all should abide only by it, and be called after it? I think that "No" is the answer to these questions.

Do they mean to say that the Roman Church does not recognise the seven Councils, or that the Greek Church has particular rights over them? It is indeed the time to use St. Paul's words: "Are they Israelites? so am I; children of Abraham? so am I; servitors of Christ? I, more than they." These Councils belong to us as much as to them, nay more than to them. I know well that they were held in the East, that the emperors residing or governing in the East procured their assembly.

But, for the most part, they only represent an orthodox Roman victory won over an Eastern heresy; or, to speak more charitably, a remedy applied by the Latin Church to her Greek sister, infected by some doctrinal malady.

Let us sum them up. Arius was condemned at Nice. Was he a Latin? No; he was a priest of Alexandria. Who defended him, both before and after the Council?—above all, Eusebius, Bishop of Nicomedia and then of Constantinople. Two of the signatories of the patriarchal encyclical must recognise themselves as successors of Eusebius. Where did the Council of Nice find its most numerous and ardent partisans and defenders? In Egypt and in the West. From whence came the famous term *homoousios* which has served as a password for Nicene orthodoxy? Most probably from Rome.

Why was the second Œcumenical Council held? To uphold the faith of Nice, continually fought against in the East, during upwards of half a century. Who convoked it? The Latin Emperor Theodosius. Who declared that he knew no other faith than that which was preached to the Romans by St. Peter, which was taught in Rome by Pope Damasus, and at Alexandria by the Bishop Peter, successor to Athanasius? Who were the heretics condemned at this Council? Eudoxius and Macedonius of Constantinople; Apollinarius of Laodicea in Syria; Eunomius, Aetius, and other members of the Greek clergy. Not a single Latin figures amongst these names. Against whom was the third Œcumenical Council at Ephesus held? Against Nestorius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, the fourth heretical predecessor of his Beatitude Anthimius.

Eutyches, a monk of Constantinople, and Dioscorus, Patriarch of Alexandria, by their excesses either in doctrine or jurisdiction, brought about the assembly of the fourth Council at Chalcedon. What did this Council do? It deposed Dioscorus, and punished his accomplices, under the effective direction of the papal legates, in virtue of the orders brought by them. Furthermore, it drew up a profession of faith, in which is found the famous expression *in duabus naturis*. From whence came this dogmatic term, this new password of orthodoxy? From the East? No; the greater number of the members of the Council abhorred it. It came from Rome, and figures as an essential element in the exposition of faith addressed by Pope Leo to the Patriarch Flavian; that is to say, in a document of which the *ecthesis* of Chalcedon is only a Greek reproduction.

The fifth Council, it is true, scores a temporary victory, won by the Emperor Justinian and the Greek episcopate, over Vigilius; but, all the same, no point of doctrine or of faith was discussed at it. It was simply a question as to whether the condemnation of certain books was opportune or not. The Pope was inopportunist, the Council opportunist, and for the sake of peace, the Pope gave in to the decree of condemnation. But the proof that he was in the right is shown by the fact that this very condemnation was misunderstood in the West, and caused serious troubles and prolonged schisms.

At the sixth Council let us now see what was the position taken by the papal legates. They arrived, bearing letters from the Pope, where the orthodox doctrine was exposed and inculcated

against the monothelite heresy, which had been prevalent for more than forty years in all the patriarchates of the East, save that of Jerusalem. At the time of the Council, and at the assembly itself, this heresy was openly represented by the Patriarch of Antioch, and secretly by the Patriarch of Constantinople. This latter, seeing the legates supported by the emperor, decided to join their side.

In the final condemnation, besides the Patriarch of Antioch, and a few other monothelites of Constantinople, we see figuring the names of several former Patriarchs, of whom four were of Constantinople. It is true that we also find that of Pope Honorius, who had made the mistake, quite at the beginning of the affair, of allowing himself to be guided by the Patriarch Sergius, under whose inspiration he wrote imprudent letters, which his clergy and successors hastened to repudiate.

And what of the seventh Council, that of the Images? In 754 the Greek episcopate, ever docile to the wishes of the court, condemned, in an almost plenary¹ assembly, the practice of venerating images, which, indeed, had been proscribed for over twenty years by the government. At Rome, during the same period, the use and veneration of images was maintained, but not without the endurance of persecution. But this practice triumphed at last—but not for good—at the Œcumenical Council of Constantinople in 787. It seems to me that from all this it is evident that, if there is one place in the world more

¹ At the iconoclastic Council there were present 336 bishops. Taking into consideration the limits of the empire at the time, this figure represents many more than the majority of the occupied Sees.

than another where they can claim the seven Œcumenical Councils, it is in Rome; and that if there is one place more than another where the mention of them can raise gloomy reflections, it ought to be Constantinople.

We will count up the Patriarchs whose memory has been condemned at these Councils, and who showed themselves openly to be against their decisions: Eusebius, Macedonius, Eudoxius, Demophelus, Nestorius, Acacius, Timotheus, Anthimius, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul, Peter, John VI., Anastasius, Constantine, Nicetas, Theodotus, Anthony, John VII. Nineteen heretical Patriarchs, and that in a period of only 500 years. And I have only here mentioned the chiefs of the clan, the notorious heretics. The list would be mightily prolonged if we had to give a place in it to all the Patriarchs who could be taxed with hesitation, faults of conduct, such as those that are held up in triumph against the Popes Liberius, Vigilius, and Honorius.

But they will say to me, if it is true that, on the whole, the first seven Œcumenical Councils represent an orthodox faith defended against us by the Roman Church, at least we can say that we have upheld this orthodoxy, whereas the Roman Church has either abandoned or corrupted it. Abandoned it? In what? Which is the dogma defined in these Councils that the Church of Rome has since repudiated? What is the formula established by them that does not figure expressly in her professions of faith?

Corrupted? Under this head come the accusations enumerated above, the *Filioque*, baptism by affusion, unleavened bread, &c. They would do well to point out to us, in the ancient Councils, one

decree, one canon, one word which represents a prohibition relating to any one of these points. Which of the Œcumenical Councils regulated the doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Ghost,¹ the mode of administering baptism, the efficacy of such or such a portion of the Eucharistic liturgy, the choice between leavened or unleavened bread, the conditions of expiation beyond the tomb, or the relation between the ban of original sin and the special position of the Blessed Virgin-Mother.

But, in specifying, we should have added—What of yourselves? In denying our definitions, in treating them, not only as doubtful, but as erroneous, do you not define as much as we do—do you not dogmatise as much as we do?

III

But let us come to details, and let us begin with the celebrated *Filioque*. You are forced to allow that this interpolation into the Symbol is not the doing of the Roman Church; that she submitted to it far more than she introduced it. You expressly avow it; you even quote, in order to strengthen your statement, texts which, by the way, might have been more exactly quoted,² but

¹ We shall see farther on that the Symbol attributed to the second Council does not actually belong to it. What it says of the Holy Ghost—"Et in Spiritum Sanctum, Dominum et vivificantem qui ex Patre procedit, qui cum Patre et Filio simul adoratur et conglorificatur, qui locutus est per prophetas"—expresses neither the divinity nor consubstantiality of the Holy Ghost. In 381 a pneumatomast might have signed this formula. And it is a good sign that it did not emanate from a Council where this precise heresy was condemned.

² The *Liber pontificalis* in the life of Leo III. says that this Pope caused to be engraved on two tablets in the Confession of St. Peter, the text of the Symbol in Greek and in Latin: "Hic

all the same this raises no doubts among you. Certainly the Roman Church ended by tolerating and then admitting the *Filioque*; she put herself into the position of being accused of a crime, if this is a crime. "Yes, it is a crime," you say, "surely, and one which is most abominable." Let us see. Where is the ecclesiastical law that forbids adding to the Creed necessary explanations or even useful ones?

The most ancient Symbol is surely not that which we say or sing at the Mass: this one does not date back farther than the fourth century. Before this, only the Creed called the Apostles' Creed was known—that is to say, as the latest researches of erudition have proved, the very ancient Baptismal Creed of the Roman Church. At the time of the Council of Nice, all the Churches of the East, as well as the West, used this venerable formula, everywhere identically the same save for a few amplifications added here and there; for, in those ancient times, no great inconvenience was felt in touching up the text of the Symbol.

The Council of Nice added words and even absolutely new phrases, with the precise intention of eliminating, among those who recited it, the least suspicion of Arianism. "This is true," you will say, "but it was the Council of Nice." Agreed; but let us take the Nicene Creed and compare it, save for the *Filioque*, with the Creed which is common to us. Who drew up this common Symbol, this sacred Creed, which you reproach us for

vero pro amore et cautela orthodoxæ fidei fecit scutos ex argento II., scriptos utrosque symbolum." . . . His Beatitude transforms the original text of the narration into an inscription: "Hæc Leo, posui amore et cautela," &c.

having augmented? Was it the first Œcumenical Council? No. Was it the second? No; because it is certainly older than this Council. Therefore, being neither of the first nor of the second Œcumenical Councils, but composed somewhere in the East between the two, it can only be from some authority inferior to an Œcumenical Council.

Now, let us compare its text with the authentic text of Nice. The difference is enormous. Not, be it well understood, that there is any contradiction between the two, but from the point of view of development. Certain beliefs are expressed in the second that were not so in the first. If it is abominable to have added to the Creed the expression of the belief in the Procession of the Holy Ghost, *ex filio*, how much more so is it to have added all this series of dogmas:—

1. The birth of Christ by the operation of the Holy Ghost, from the womb of the Virgin Mary.
2. His crucifixion under Pontius Pilate.
3. His burial.
4. The scriptural prediction of His resurrection.
5. His place in heaven at the right hand of the Father.
6. His eternal reign (against Marcellus of Ancyra).
7. (The Holy Ghost), Ruler, Life-giver, proceeding from the Father, adored and glorified with the Father and the Son, the Inspirer of Prophets.
8. The Church, one holy, catholic, and apostolic.
9. The remission of sins by baptism.
10. The resurrection of the dead.
11. Life everlasting.

It will be objected that the majority of these doctrines are found, under different forms, in the Apostles' Creed, long before the Council of Nice. I grant it, but it is not a question here of the orthodoxy or of the traditional character of this or that doctrine, but only of the inviolability of the formula. Now, I do not see that this inviolability was ever claimed for the Apostles' Creed. I maintain that, on the contrary, it was often retouched, even in Rome, the place of its origin. I look in vain among the ecclesiastical laws anterior to the Council of Ephesus, the third Œcumenical Council, for any prohibition to this effect.

The Symbol of Nice had often been remodelled, in the most orthodox centres, and combined in divers ways with the Apostles' Creed, for use at baptism. The Creed of Constantinople is the result of one such combination. It seems to be nothing more nor less than the baptismal Symbol of Jerusalem, seemingly drawn up by St. Cyril, and adopted for its own use by the Church of Constantinople; not before the second Œcumenical Council, because at that time she was Arian, but later, between 381 and 451. Nothing authorises us to believe that this Creed was promulgated by the Council of 381. It is certain, in any case, that the next Council, that of Ephesus, held in 431, ignores it absolutely. For the Council of Ephesus, there was only one Creed, that of Nice, the true and the primitive one. If it prohibits any other Symbol, it is in favour of that of Nice and not of that of Constantinople.

It is useless, therefore, to bring forward the Council of Ephesus against us. If the prohibition given by this Council represents anything but a temporary measure, if it is a perpetual law, then

it attacks, not only the *Filioque*, but the Symbol of Constantinople in its entirety.

But this Symbol was, in the end, accepted, and it was submitted to the Council of Chalcedon, conjointly with that of Nice; the Church of Rome has introduced it into her baptismal ritual. That is true. With regard to the Roman Church, the introduction of the Symbol of Constantinople was late, it dates back only to the time of Justinian; it represents one of the fruits of the religious policy of that prince, who was very much preoccupied with the promotion of unity and conformity between the different Churches of his empire. Perhaps the Church of Rome might have done better to keep to her old tradition and to assure to the Apostles' Creed the exclusive place it had held till then. It is evident that, for the sake of peace, "for a certain time" she substituted for it the Symbol of Constantinople, in the same way as she tolerated that the Churches of France and Spain should chant this Symbol at the Mass, with the addition of the *Filioque*, which seems to have been first introduced in Spain towards the sixth century. Her resistance to this last innovation continued down to the eleventh century. It was not that she considered the addition of the *Filioque* as a violation of the essential ecclesiastical laws, but knowing better than the Frankish clergy the state of mind of the Greeks, and their propensity to take umbrage at any divergencies, she judged it inopportune to give them any cause for criticism. Thus the Creed which they accuse us of having interpolated contains nothing, either in its origin or its authority, which forbids necessary interpolations. It comes neither from the Council of Nice nor from that of Constantinople; it represents in itself an enormous violation of the

imaginary prohibition which they oppose to the *Filioque*. It is the Nicene Creed seriously interpolated by a particular authority, without previous consultation with the assembly of the Churches. If, then, they discover a mote in our eye, let them first begin by taking the large beam out of their own.

But they do not confine themselves to disputing the right in virtue of which the Latin Church completed her Symbol. They deny the doctrine formulated in this addition. But I have no intention of treading on theological ground. For long centuries the Greeks and Latins have quarrelled over this subject, the Greeks proving to the Latins that the Holy Ghost proceeds only from the Father, the Latins demonstrating to the Greeks that He proceeds from the Son also. All the arguments, all the texts, have long been well known. They can be found in any number of books, so that I shall confine myself to two observations. First of all, this question seems to be of a very metaphysical order. It is difficult to see in what way it interests the religious sentiment. Could it not, ought it not to be allowed to remain quiet directly it becomes clear that it compromises ecclesiastical peace? Long before the Greek theologians began to make a case of conscience of it, the *Filioque* existed in the Creeds of Spain and France, and still longer had it been taught in the West that the Holy Ghost proceeded *ex utroque*. Photius was the first to raise the question, and he was urged on to this by his desire to find the Latins in fault. Ought we not, amongst our far-off ancestors, to prefer the Apostles to the makers of discord, and desire times of union and not schismatical crises?

The other observation that I feel bound to make is this: When in this question they do not confine themselves to counting and weighing the scriptural texts, the testimony of the Fathers, and the metaphysical arguments—when they endeavour to become acquainted with the story of the dispute, beginning with its most profound causes, this is what they arrive at. From the fourth, or even the third century, not to go still farther back, two systems of theology were running concurrently, each endeavouring to explain the inexplicable mystery of the Blessed Trinity. The one adhered to in the West placed the essence of the mystery in the consubstantiality; it cultivated above everything else the idea of the Divine Unity, subordinating to it the idea of the Triple Personality. The other system, prevailing in the East, leaving more or less aside the hierarchy of the Divine Persons, concentrates its attention upon the Divine Unity. For the Easterns, the Trinity is, beyond everything else, cosmological, for by it they explain the origin of the world. Of necessity the existence of the world demands the existence of divine persons.¹ For the West, the Trinity has nothing to gain from the world; it is a necessity of the Divine Being. Here the Trinity is immanent; there, it is economic. It is useless to dissimulate. We agree on the symbolical formulæ, except only the *Filioque*;

¹ I do not pretend to say here that such a proposition is expressly affirmed by the Fathers of the Greek Church. What I mean to say is, that this idea is found more or less deeply, underlying all their theological developments. The correction of these comes, not from philosophical conceptions which serve as the substratum, but from ecclesiastical tradition formulated in the Councils or elsewhere. In the East, as with us, respect for tradition has often prevented persons from drawing from doubtful principles, false conclusions, such as would have caused the erection of orthodox theology upon a system of philosophy, more or less open to criticism.

we agree on the acceptance of the traditional doctrines that they express; but we do not always agree upon the way of explaining this formula, or of combining these ideas. Faith unites us; theology often separates us. St. Augustine in his theory of the Trinity, in his philosophical manner of conceiving it, differs widely from St. Gregory of Nazianzen. But which of them is right? I have just said, how little religious interest these questions of pure theology or of high and dry metaphysics possess. Should I then conclude that every one is wrong, and that it is an offence against God to try and penetrate His mysteries? Certainly not. Should I settle the question by showing on which side the Roman Church is to be found? Again I say "No." I will confine myself to pointing out an historical fact. The Greek theology has been defined on this point, by the hands of the great Cappadocian doctors, Basil, Gregory of Nazianzen, and Gregory of Nyssa, in the same way as the Latin theology received its definite guidance from St. Augustine. Far be it from me to depreciate the three great servants of God, who, in the decline of the fourth century, shed such a pure light of doctrine and virtue over Eastern Catholicism. Yet we cannot conceal the fact that these theologians represent the orthodoxy of converts. Their masters, their predecessors, had been, as we hear, semi-Arians. They breathed the same atmosphere as Basil of Ancyra, Eustathius of Sebaste, and others equally celebrated for their hostility to the consubstantiality. When this theological world, after much hesitation and weakness, finally gave in to the Council of Nice, it was not without reservations. They stipulated for the three hypostases, with more insistence than

it would have become true champions of Nice, or the Pope of Rome, or St. Athanasius to have exhibited. It would not be astonishing if—I do not say in their faith, but in their theology—they had retained some attachment to their former ideas. They accepted the Symbol of Nice, but they explained it in the light of the philosophy of Origen and Eusebius of Cæsarea.

St. Augustine is free from these influences. He treats the faith of Nicæa directly by reason, without having his mind preoccupied by some previous system of theology. Origen does not weigh his thoughts; if, long before his time, they reasoned and disputed about the doctrine of the Trinity, he quietly ignores the fact. To an indifferent observer this would be a circumstance in his favour. I only wish to touch upon it, for were I to develop it I should soon have to go beyond the limits of this work. Perhaps we might find ground for some mutual understanding or discussion if persons really desirous of ceasing disunion and disagreement, men well instructed in dogma and tradition, would unite to confer on the Procession of the Holy Ghost. Why could not this be arranged? Diplomacy settles many quarrels, by examining them coolly and *in a pacific spirit*; and this is a vital condition. The pacific spirit does not reveal itself in this patriarchal encyclical.

IV

After the recriminations on the *Filioque*, a long series of protestations follows against certain Latin usages which are not to be found in the Greek Church, and which, for that reason, appear to the Oriental mind extremely reprehensible, *e.g.* baptism

by affusion; the consecration of unleavened bread; the neglect of the Epiclesis; and, finally, communion under one species. These diversities of custom do not appear to us, Latins, to be of great importance. The Roman Church, while remaining faithful to her own proper usages, allows other Churches to observe their own rites. At different epochs the Popes have even intervened to prevent their representatives in the East from insisting upon the Uniates conforming their traditional customs, in these particulars, to the Latin rite. The Orientals, on the other hand, manifest no such spirit of toleration. The heads of the Greek Church insist that we should follow their ceremonies in every detail. They go so far as to see in our particularities a cause of nullity; at times they recognise neither our baptism, nor our Eucharist! In former ages their list of complaints against us was much longer. They protested against the Latin discipline of ecclesiastical celibacy; against the fast of Saturdays in Lent; to the interruption of the Alleluia during the weeks before Easter; to the shaven faces of the clergy, &c., &c. It was like the case of an inexperienced traveller who, on first leaving his native land, found everything wrong which was not done as he had been accustomed to see it.

The Byzantine Greeks did not reflect that the tables could be turned upon themselves, and that they could be called upon to give an account of certain usages peculiar to them. Why, for instance, do they put hot water into the consecrated chalice? Why has the Patriarch alone the power of consecrating the holy chrism? This last point is a manifest encroachment on the rights of the bishops. Why are the Patriarchs, whose office was always as im-

60 THE ENCYCLICAL OF ANTHIMIUS

movable as that of all their bishops, now changed as often as parliamentary ministers?¹

I do not wish to enlarge upon this circumstance, for I am more anxious to defend the Latin Church than to attack the Greeks. I therefore return to the objections they make against us.

First, with regard to baptism, they say that the Church of the seven Synods baptizes by a triple immersion in the water, that Pope Pelagius designated this triple immersion “a precept of our Lord,” and that the ancient baptisteries of Italy are built so as to show that, until the thirteenth century, immersion was in use there.

The text of Pope Pelagius’s degree is not given by the Patriarch, and I have had some trouble in finding it, as it is not contained in the collection of his letters hitherto published. It figures, however, in the Decree of Yvo of Chartres, i. 161. But, having found it, I am able to say that it does not prove what the Patriarch wishes it to prove. The Pope is answering an inquiry of Gaudentius, Bishop of Volterra, who had submitted the following case to him: “Whether the heretics of the Bonosiac sect,² must be baptized when they wish to become Catholics, or only reconciled? What rendered their baptism doubtful was that they baptized only in the name of Christ,³ and by a single immersion—*quia in nomine*

¹ His Beatitude Anthimius has once more verified this grave departure from the ancient discipline. Having been Patriarch for about one year, he has been compelled, between the composition of this article and the correction of the proofs, to tender his resignation to the Synod! What a pity!

² The name of the sect is not mentioned, but it refers either to the Photinians or Bonosiacs, for the Pope speaks of Sirmium and of Singidunum as the classic land of the heresy in question.

³ This form is used by the sect known as the Swedenborgians at the present time.

solummodo Christi, una etiam mersione se asserunt baptizari. Against this proceeding Pelagius quotes the words of our Lord: "Go ye and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." He says that this evangelical precept bids us administer baptism in the name of the Blessed Trinity, by a triple immersion—in *nomine Trinitatis trina etiam mersione*. It is perfectly clear that he in no way opposes immersion to affusion, but only the ritual of *thrice* to the ritual of *once*, and the formula "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost" to the formula "in the name of Christ," or "Jesus." Again, we must remark that, in the text, the words *trina mersio* have but very secondary importance. He goes on to tell the Bishop of Volterra to find out if the heretics of whom there is question have been baptized with the formula, "In the name of the Father," &c., or with the other, and to admit their baptism as valid in the first case, but to reject it in the second. The triple immersion is not again alluded to, which proves clearly that, where he spoke of the evangelical precept given by our Lord Himself, he only had in his mind the text of St. Matthew, "Go and teach ye all nations," &c. Therefore, if he mentions the *trina mersio*, it is merely to signalise in the matter a correspondence with the triplicity of the form, and not at all to show that this was of divine ordinance. This interpretation is also confirmed by the attitude of St. Gregory with regard to the use in Spain, where the *mersio* was single. St. Gregory declares that he sees no objection to their baptizing by a single immersion. It was precisely on this point that the great Pope formulated

the principle that, in the Church, the unity of faith had not suffered by the diversity of usages: *In una fide nil officit sanctæ Ecclesiæ consuetudo diversa.*

Thus the text of Pelagius is of no value whatever in the present question. His Beatitude ought to have abstained from quoting it, or, having done so, he should at least not have mutilated it. Neither Pelagius nor Gregory dreamt of opposing the *mersio* at baptism by another act. For them the *mersio* was the only way of conferring baptism known at that period for general use.

Let us now examine a little more closely what underlies this technical term. His Beatitude seems to be very sure that immersion was practised in the West up to the thirteenth century. As far as words go, appearances seem to favour his assertion. The principal act in the ceremony of baptism is generally called *mersio*, or immersion, as we have just seen. The old rituals say *mergis*, where they indicate to the celebrant what he is to do. But, all the same, we must not adhere to the ordinary meaning of words where it is a question of such specific acceptation of them.

We constantly see representations of the celebration of baptism on monuments; the Gospel scene of the baptism of our Lord, or even ordinary baptisms. But do we ever see total immersion, the neophyte plunged into the water so as to disappear completely? Such a thing is *never* seen. This immersion, which is the Greek form, is never to be met with, either in the mosaics of ancient churches, or in the paintings of the Catacombs, nor in ordinary pictures or domestic objects, glasses, spoons, &c., nor sculptured, nor engraved on marble. In all such ancient monuments the neophyte appears standing,

his feet in the water, but the greater part of the body out of the water, while water is poured on his head, either with the hand or with a vase, often in the shape of a dove. This is baptism by affusion, not baptism by immersion; it is not a bath taken by plunging into deep water or into a tank; it is more like a douche taken over a large vase.

But they will say,—between your baptism by simple affusion and this ancient rite there is, at all events, this difference: in the old Latin ritual the feet are immersed. Agreed; but all will allow that here the ablution of the head is of more importance than that of the feet. Furthermore, the technical expression *mersio*, *mergis*, does not refer to the washing of the feet, but only to the pouring of the water. *Mergis eum tertio*, the rituals say. It is quite clear that when this action takes place the neophyte has already gone down into the tank; his feet are in the water, but he is not yet baptized. He will only be so after the *mersio*, accompanied by the sacramental words. This *mersio* is repeated three times, without the neophyte's moving or going out of the font. It can, therefore, only be the act by which the celebrant pours the water upon the head that is regarded as essential, and nothing else. The baptisteries which the patriarchal encyclical alludes to bear testimony to our custom and not to his. Not one of them has the necessary depth for the water to cover even a man of middle stature.¹ In fact, there is in this a mistaken interpretation. The immersion spoken of in the old texts is nothing else but the actual pouring, practised, without doubt,

¹ A font in St. Martin's Church, Canterbury, dating from the sixth century, demonstrates that no adult could have been baptized in it by total immersion, but only by affusion.

with a greater effusion of water, but without any essential difference, in early times.

And this belief finds confirmation in the use of the words *tinctio*, *tingere*, to designate baptism. This synonym has been used in ecclesiastical language since the days of Tertullian. Now what does *tingere* mean? Simply "to wet," not "to immerse."

Is there any need to add that baptism by immersion presupposes a free disposal of a large quantity of water, and for this reason is incompatible with certain situations and certain facts? How, for instance, are we to believe that the 3000 Jews baptized in Jerusalem, on the day of the first Pentecost, were treated in this manner? (Acts ii. 41). And, lastly, it is an absolutely undeniable fact that the baptism of invalids, and clinical baptism, as it was called, was not, and could not be, performed by immersion; it was administered by the simple pouring of the water. Without doubt this baptism was looked upon as a sort of makeshift, for it was always considered more desirable to be baptized with all the ceremonies of the Church and in a public and solemn assembly. But this preference was in no wise founded upon the idea that clinical baptism was invalid. No one ever thought of iteration of such baptisms. From this we conclude that, if baptism by affusion is valid under any circumstances, why should not this *minimum* suffice also for persons in good health. It is possible to dispute over the opportuneness of the simplification, but not over the validity of the simplified rite.

"The Church of the seven Œcumenical Councils, &c., after the example of the Lord, celebrated the Eucharist with leavened bread—a custom followed

for more than a thousand years in the East as well as in the West; but the papistical Church in the eleventh century made an innovation by the introduction of the use of unleavened bread." Here are some precise assertions, but, unfortunately, they are very far from being verified as facts. One point alone is certain, and that is that it was only in the eleventh century that the Greeks began to quarrel with the Latins about the use of unleavened bread. But as to the date when the use of unleavened bread was introduced, or what was the rapidity of the spread of this usage, no one can say; in the present conditions of historical research it is absolutely unknown. In fixing the dates, the Patriarch affirms what he does not and cannot know or prove. He knows still less whether the example of our Lord (which is the sole foundation for his exclusiveness), is in favour of his or of the Latin usage. The three Gospels of St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke relate the last moments of Christ, starting from the idea that He celebrated the Pasch just before his death. St. John vi. gives a different impression; and it seems certain that we shall never succeed in arriving at a solution of this question.

If the conclusion drawn from the text of St. John were the only legitimate one, the Greek usage would have the example of our Lord in its favour; but if our Lord celebrated the Pasch on the eve of His death, it is clear that His example is followed by the Latin and condemned by the Greek usage. So that there is, at all events, a doubt on the point. Under these conditions of historical knowledge, why should liberty be restricted? The only logical solution is, that both usages are equally authorised; and this is the Roman solution.

They also reproach us with admitting that, in the consecration of the Blessed Eucharist, the efficacious words are those of the institution, "This is My Body," "This is My Blood," while, according to the Church of the seven Œcumenical Councils, the efficacious words are the invocation of the Holy Ghost. And they pretend that the ancient Roman and Gallican rituals support this view, and thus condemn the belief and practice of the "papistical Church." The truth is, that this belief, which has not, so far as I am aware, been formulated directly and explicitly in any dogmatic decision, is authorised by very ancient testimonies. We could even find precedents for it in the usage of the Greek Church itself. According to their rite, the words of institution are pronounced in a loud voice, with great solemnity, whereas the *épiclesis* is recited in a low voice. But what it behoves us to examine before anything else are the liturgical Latin texts.

Now, in the formula of the Roman Mass, which for its details dates back at least to the time of Pope Damasus¹ (366–384), there is no question of the Holy Ghost. In the Gallican formulæ, which differ greatly from one another, there are some that speak of the Eucharistic transformation as being performed by the power of the Holy Ghost, but there are others that do not thus speak of it. This form of prayer was, therefore, not considered obligatory in the West. To admit the contention of the modern Greeks would be to declare the nullity of the greater

¹ The Byzantine liturgies, called of St. Basil and St. John Chrysostom, would be about contemporary with Damasus, if these Fathers were their authors, which is not proved. As to the Roman canon it is attested since the days of Damasus, but it bears the name of no author, and nothing goes to prove that it is not much more ancient.

part of the Masses celebrated in the West, since the fourth century at least. Would the Greek Church have waited till modern times to protest against such an enormity and to try to remedy such a frightful disorder had she believed it to exist?

His Beatitude Anthimius, towards the end of his encyclical, reminds us of the famous words of Vincent of Lerins: "In the Catholic Church, we must adhere with care to whatever has been believed everywhere, in every place, by every body." This is a case in point. In a liturgical formula, or in a ritual, where are the essential parts?

To know this we have only to compare the texts with the usages. What is essential is found everywhere, and is found in every instance, however far back we may go. It is thus that our theologians proceeded in dealing with the sacramental forms, notably in the case of Holy Orders.¹ The Middle Ages had handed down most precise formulæ and very expressive rites, wherein, according to appearances, the essential parts of the sacramental forms should be sought. But neither these formulæ nor these rites were to be found in the Greek usage, and it was also discovered that they were not contained either in the more ancient Latin books. From this fact, our theologians did not hesitate to repudiate a deeply rooted tradition—they considered as essential what was common to all the Churches, and not what, at first sight, appeared to have the greatest power of expression.

Let the Greeks do the same. Let them weigh

¹ In the ordinations of bishops, priests, and deacons the essential matter and form in all valid ordinals, ancient and modern, are imposition of hands, accompanying a prayer called *oratio consecrationis*.

well that, if they have liturgical antiquities, so have we. That the Roman Church dates back to most primitive times; that its liturgical usages were already arranged and fixed at a time when the Church of Constantinople had not yet been founded.¹ If they wish to lean upon Jerusalem, or Antioch, or the Apostles, we can follow them on the same ground. It is apparently from Jerusalem and Antioch, even before the days of Nero, that the founders of Roman Christianity come. St. Peter and St. Paul are, I think, well qualified to support tradition.

The last liturgical grievance has to do with the use of the chalice. It is certain that, in doing away with communion under the species of wine, or rather in reserving it almost exclusively to priests, the Roman Church broke with an ancient usage. She did not do so without regret, or without raising opposition; but she considered that, in spite of this, she had to do so for grave reasons, into the details of which I need not enter here. The patriarchal encyclical reproaches her with having, in this respect, violated a divine precept formally given in the Gospels. This would be most extraordinary, as the Roman Church does not, any more than the Greek Church, arrogate to herself the right to alter things of divine precept. Let us consider this more closely. The Gospel text quoted by his Beatitude is taken from the account of the Last

¹ As may be imagined I attach no importance to the account of apostolical origins attributed to St. Andrew and his disciple Stachys. These legends rest solely on an apocryphal work attributed to a certain Dorotheus, Bishop of Tyre, who, however, never existed. The Church of Byzantium, considered as distinct from that of Heraclea, dates back to the end of the third century at earliest.

Supper in St. Matthew. Our Blessed Saviour, presenting the chalice to *His Apostles*, said to *them*, “Drink ye all of this.” From this invitation addressed to all the *guests* at the Last Supper, his Beatitude formulates a precept which he considers binding upon all Christians in all ages. This is a most extravagant deduction. It is refuted, not only by the text to which it is applied, but by the parallel passage in St. Mark: “And having taken the chalice, giving thanks, He gave it to them, and they all drank of it.” Who are “they”? Evidently the Apostles only. There is, therefore, no precept of our Lord. And, furthermore, do we not know that communion under one species (as an exception, it is true) dates back to the most ancient times?

The Blessed Eucharist, which the Christians reserved in their houses during the time of persecution, the Holy Communion as it was ordinarily given to the sick, and privately in the churches, was always under the species of bread, and that only. The Liturgy of the Presanctified, common to both the Latin and Greek rites, but more frequent among the latter, excludes the consecration of the chalice altogether. Here, as in the case of baptism, the Latin Church, taking into consideration the circumstances, changed the exceptional form into the ordinary form, and she in no way exceeded her rights or authority by doing so.

V

Let us now come to the points of dogma on which the Greeks raise objection:—

“The Church of the seven Œcumenical Councils, holy, catholic, &c., following the teaching inspired

by the Holy Scriptures and the apostolical tradition, prays and invokes the mercy of God to obtain pardon and repose for the souls of the faithful who have slept in the Lord; but the papistical Church, since the twelfth century, has invented and invested in the person of the Pope, as sole dispenser, a number of novelties on the fires of Purgatory, on the superabundant merits of the just, and their distribution to those who need them, and so on, promising thus to the just an entire reward before the general resurrection and the Last Judgment."

Here his Beatitude imputes to the Roman Church a number of things for which she could not accept responsibility. As far as Purgatory and Indulgences go, the doctrine of the Church of Rome must be sought for in the two decrees annexed to the 25th session of the Council of Trent. These decrees mention and proscribe many abuses and exaggerations of speech and practice. It is to be desired, without doubt, that these wise regulations should be better carried out. I do not fear to say that, in this department, there would be much to reform again. It is not easy always to prevent the indiscreet curiosity of theologians, nor the indiscreet devotion of pious souls. Having no authority to say what it would be best to do against such or such an abuse, I can at least (and here I must) bring to light the difference there is between the official teaching of the Church and the systems, or absurdities, which fill small books of piety, or which find their way, though always as private opinions only, into works of theology. The Church teaches "that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls therein detained are solaced by the suffrages of the faithful, and principally by the sacrifice of the altar." This is

exactly, under another form, what his Beatitude declares to be the belief of the Church of the seven Œcumenical Councils. In fine, if this Church has always prayed for the faithful who sleep in the Lord, it is because she judges that these departed souls have need of prayers. They are not damned souls, and they are not the elect, already in possession of celestial happiness. They are faithful souls who, without being absolutely condemned by the Divine Justice, have still some debt to pay to His Divine Majesty. This is exactly the category of souls classed in Purgatory by the Council of Trent.

As to the fire of Purgatory, there is no question of it in this decree. The Catholic Church has never canonised this detail. The poets, from Homer to Dante, seem to know many things about the other world. Their imaginations, like those of artists, orators, and philosophers, may have their utility in fixing ideas and in causing them to enter into certain minds. All the same, even with simple people, the Council of Trent forbids the use of these means of instruction. It prescribes that we “should avoid in sermons preached to the masses difficult and subtle questions, devoid of interest for edification and piety.” It forbids, no matter whom, to write or dispute on uncertain and contestable points. As to practices in which only vain curiosity, the passion of gain, or superstition are concerned, it recommends them especially to the severity of the bishops. It is but too evident that these wise prescriptions are often violated. For my own part, I have heard more than one sermon in which they were forgotten. Those who are charged with enforcing the decrees of the Council of Trent would have enough to do if they had to punish all the extravagant language

which imprudent preachers allow themselves to use. But these intemperances are not evils peculiar to the Latin Church. I do not think that his Beatitude Anthimius would claim as his own all the theories propounded in the pulpits of the "Church of the seven Œcumenical Councils," or which circulate in the little pamphlets destined for the Greek populace.

What I have just said about Purgatory can also be said about Indulgences. The Council of Trent, in its decree, devotes only a few words to the official doctrine, which brings it down to two obligatory points, viz., the utility of indulgences and the right of the Church to grant them. The rest of the decree is only a long protestation against the exaggerations and the abuses which have arisen on this point. I am not going to enter here into a long dissertation on the theory of indulgences. Those who are willing to study it calmly have no difficulty in seeing that it is an extremely ancient usage in the Church. Why do they speak to us of the twelfth century? During the persecutions, were not the apostates pardoned in consideration of the martyrs? Have not the bishops always recognised the right to shorten the length of expiatory punishments when they judged it useful to do so? As to the principle of the matter, where is the father of a family who does not almost daily grant indulgences to his children? One of them has been very good, the other, on the contrary, very naughty. The first intercedes, and the punishment of the culprit is lessened by the father, in consideration of the merit of the good child. It is thus that God deals with His Christian family. Naturally, He does not act Himself, it is the Church which regulates the

details. This is the chief point of the incriminated doctrine, represented to us as a “novelty of the twelfth century”!

Assuredly there has been, and there will without doubt again be, more than one fault to be found when we come to the domain of its application. Where are there not abuses? Instead of taking scandal, they would do much better to help us to extirpate them. If ecclesiastical reunion could be re-established, it would not be profitable to the Greeks only. The Latins would have their share; they would be sure, at all events, that an eye would always be open to certain exaggerations, certain weaknesses, which then would appear all the more dangerous since they might jeopardise the re-established unity.

The last question which remains for me to treat of to-day is that of the Immaculate Conception. This dogma presents two aspects. Is the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception traditional or not? Has the Latin Church the right to proclaim it by herself? On the first question, I will avoid all discussion from the outset, and will confine myself to one single observation. The Patriarch affirms, with all the pomp of his formularies, that the Church of the seven Œcumenical Councils, one, holy, catholic, and apostolic, proclaims as a dogma that only one conception was immaculate—that of Christ; whereas the papistical Church innovated, forty years ago, by proclaiming as a dogma that the Blessed Virgin was also conceived without sin.

Very well, let us admit with his Beatitude that the “papistical Church” has innovated in settling the question in one way; but has not the non-papistical Church innovated in settling it in another

way? Which is the Œcumenical Council in which the solution upon which they now dogmatise was, I do not say arrived at, but even proposed? In what book of the early Greek Fathers do we find this problem even formulated? It is true that the occasion would hardly have presented itself, for the Greek theologians scarcely treated of the doctrine of original sin. It was not the same with the Latin theologians, beginning with St. Augustine, the first of our doctors who had to deal with questions of this kind.

They tell us that this dogma was unknown in the ancient Church. In the form in which recent decisions have stated it, that is true; but it was implicitly contained in other beliefs. It is not contrary to the Eastern Church that the Council of Ephesus canonised the celebrated title of Mother of God. At this same Council the Greek Church accepted officially, for the second time, the condemnation of Celestius and Pelagius, pronounced fifteen years earlier by the head of the Latin Church. These two dogmas, of original sin and the divine maternity of Mary, could not be brought in contact with each other without casting a light upon the subject now before us. They say that "some illustrious papist theologians" have equally contested the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. That is true, but even illustrious papist theologians are liable to err. Here, those in favour of whom the dogmatic sentence has been pronounced are those best inspired with that devotion towards Mary which the Greek Church has, as it were, inculcated by her example, by her liturgical institutions, and by the writings of her doctors. In its most ancient forms, the honour paid to the Blessed Virgin is of

Byzantine importation. It is extraordinary to see this tide going backwards, and to hear from the East episcopal voices raised in protest against the new honours given by us to the Mother of God.

As to the right, in virtue of which the dogma of the Immaculate Conception was proclaimed, in 1854, by Pope Pius IX., it is too closely linked with the prerogatives of the Holy See for me to speak of it before I have treated of them.

CHAPTER IV

THE ROMAN CHURCH BEFORE THE TIME OF CONSTANTINE

IT is evident, at least from our point of view, that the reasons for the difficulties raised by the Patriarch Anthimius are frivolous enough. There is no proportion between such cavillings and the all-important question of the unity of Christendom. It is not in its defence that irritation and divisions arise, that the dearest wishes of our Blessed Lord meet with opposition, and that His most formal recommendations are counted as of no importance.

Neither is it on that account that the division was made. The Greek Church began by separating, and when once the separation was effected, she looked out for pretexts to justify it. These pretexts have varied, and some which were formerly insisted upon are now abandoned. In Russia, where special reasons exist for not blaming too severely any innovations in the liturgy, they now only bring forward two grievances: the *Filioque* and the prerogatives of the Pope. The latter point does not even appear in the controversies of the eleventh century. There were then in the East some persons of a moderate turn of mind, such as Peter, Patriarch of Antioch, who, while blaming the custom of the use of unleavened bread and other Latin usages, laid stress only on the question of the Holy Ghost.

Even on this point the good Patriarch found some extenuating circumstances. "We ought not," said he, "to expect too much exactitude from these barbarians; it is a great deal if they believe as we do in the Trinity and in the Incarnation." If Peter, instead of Michael Cerularius, had been Patriarch of Constantinople, we may believe there would have been no quarrels in 1054.

Then, however, it was not peacemakers who had undertaken negotiations. Cerularius had begun hostilities; he wished for war, he made it, and succeeded all the better because, on the side of the Latins, arrogance and bitterness of speech were not sufficiently avoided. Now the gulf exists; the attempts to fill it up again, made at Lyons in 1274 and at Florence in 1439, had but a passing success. As time goes on it only widens. In the East all possible efforts are made to keep it open and to augment its depth. The letters of M. Khomrakoff, lately published by Mr. W. Birkbeck,¹ are very instructive in this respect. Ecclesiastical separation seems to have become a sort of ideal cultivated with affection. Not only is the very thought of an agreement repulsed with horror, but even the idea of the possibility of discussion with Rome is avoided, whilst all anxiety as to catholic unity is laid aside. The right of the Eastern Church is evident of itself; it is almost an impiety to speak in its defence—so they appear to think!

With such *illuminati*, it is evident that words are lost; let us leave them to their mysticism and let us only deal with people who stand on their feet.

The latter are well represented by the Synod of

¹ *Russia and the English Church*, tom. i. London, 1895.

the Patriarch Anthimius. They make use of their intelligence, though they only employ it in finding out new reasons for persuading themselves that they are right, and we are wrong. Such a state of mind is extraordinary. How is it that Christians and bishops can recite their creed, read the Gospel, and yet do all they can to keep up this schism, which is as absurd as it is impious? They believe they are right. And we also believe we are right; but does that prevent us from constantly seeking to make peace? Never has the Church of Rome resigned herself to schism, and she never will. Her representatives may sometimes have taken steps that are to be regretted, yet she has never ceased acting. Our oriental brethren, it is true, repeat the ancient prayers of the liturgy, in which they ask of God to maintain the union of the Churches, but those prayers were composed prior to the schism, and do not aim at it specially. Besides, must we confine ourselves to prayer alone? The Church of Rome prays also, both in its ancient forms of prayer and in the supplications to which its pastors are continually inviting us, but she does not confine herself to prayer alone. She acts. Where is action on the Greek side? In Russia? Since they believe us to be in error, why do they not seek to bring us out of it? It is clear that they feel satisfied with their isolation, and have but a very vague desire to abandon it. Here, again, we find a state of mind which has become traditional; reasonings and texts have little effect upon such dispositions. Perhaps history may have more. Ever since the beginning of Christianity there have been cavillings about texts of Scripture; and since theologians began to reason, the most complicated arguments have been

both made and refuted. But what can be done when we are face to face with facts?

I shall endeavour in this chapter, and in the one that follows it, to bring forward, though somewhat briefly, the vicissitudes to which the unity of the Church has been exposed from the time of the origin of the schism until its final consummation, and I shall pay particular attention to what concerns the Christians of the Greek rite.

I

St. Irenæus wrote his great treatise on heresies soon after the reign of Marcus Aurelius, A.D. 180. Against the Gnostics, he advances the tradition of the great Churches, beginning by quoting that of Smyrna, which, through St. Polycarp, dates back to the Apostle St. John; then he continues:—

“But it would be too long to enumerate here the series of all the Churches; it suffices to point out the apostolic tradition, the teaching that has come down to us by episcopal succession in the Church of Rome, the greatest and most ancient of all,¹ known everywhere, and founded in Rome by the two glorious Apostles, Paul and Peter. This tradition suffices of itself to confound all those who, in one way or another, by self-conceit, vainglory, blindness, or erroneous judgment, have deviated from the truth. Indeed, the superior pre-eminence of that Church is such that every Church—I mean the faithful of any country whatsoever—necessarily agrees with her, that is every Church in any country in which the apostolic tradition has been preserved without interruption.”²

¹ *Maximæ et antiquissimæ.*

² Irenæus, iii. 3.

It would be difficult to meet with a clearer assertion :

1. Of unity of doctrine in the universal Church.
2. Of the sole sovereign importance of the Church of Rome, as witness, guardian, and organ of the apostolic tradition.
3. Of her superior pre-eminence over the whole of Christianity.

It suffices, however, to cast a glance upon the state of the Church towards the end of the second century to see how just is the impression transmitted to us by the holy Bishop of Lyons. Where were then the great Sees which, later on, occupied such a prominent place in the sacred hierarchy? Jerusalem had but a little flock of Greek Christians, colonists from the Hellenic towns of Palestine, having no link with the primitive community that had lived with the Apostles. Of Byzantium it is useless to speak ; everything causes us to believe she had not, as yet, any bishop at all. Alexandria had one, and her series of bishops may be traced to the very days of the Apostles ; but when St. Irenæus wrote, Alexandria was hardly known, except by her fecundity in producing the Gnostic heresies. Antioch was a little more in evidence, thanks to recollections of the New Testament, and of one of her earliest bishops, the celebrated martyr St. Ignatius. It would be difficult to say anything about the successors of the latter. If Theophilus of Antioch had already written his books of apology, if the *Pedagogue*, and other works of Clement, were already in circulation among the learned in Alexandria, the ink with which they had been written had scarcely had time to dry. And those literary works have really nothing which characterises them as the ex-

pression of any hierarchical tradition. We must wait until the time of Demetrius of Alexandria and Serapion of Antioch—that is to say, until the time of Severus—to see the rise of those two great Sees. In short, there was but one situation to be compared, as regards tradition, to that of Rome, the situation of Asia Minor itself, the country which had kept up the sacred memories of St. John, St. Philip, St. Polycarp, Papias, Thrasius, Mellitus, and many other illustrious Christians. St. Irenæus shows a very just appreciation of ecclesiastical relationships when quoting the tradition of those Churches by the side of that of Rome.

But the latter had, even at that epoch, a special pre-eminence, as is proved by the following facts.

II

1. St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans shows the celebrity of that still infant Church. "Your faith," says he, "is spoken of in the whole world." Without this significant congratulation the very fact that St. Paul addressed this Epistle to the Church of Rome proves the special importance of that community. The Epistle to the Romans is, indeed, a grand dogmatical treatise. In it the Apostle resumes his long debates with the judaising Christians, and expresses his views on the universal character of the Gospel. It is difficult to believe that this exposition of doctrine was suggested by any prepossessions concerning the condition of the Church of Rome. He only knew that Church, as yet, from hearsay, and it does not appear that the preaching of the Gospel at Rome had been hindered by any opposing judaising mission, as had been the case at

Antioch, in Galatia, and at Corinth. Why, then, did St. Paul think he ought to explain his doctrine before the Roman Church? Doubtless because from the time of her foundation he recognised her great importance.

2. Later on, Paul came to Rome. St. Peter resided there also, at a date and during a space of time not easy to determine; there, both Apostles suffered martyrdom; there, both had their sepulchres. Thus the metropolis of the Roman world received its consecration as the centre of Christian unity. Long before, the conscience of the Jews had opposed, in its reveries and in its prophecies, the great "Babylon" of the West to the Holy City of Jerusalem. Now, at the epoch when St. Peter and St. Paul died, Jerusalem witnessed the departure of the early Christians and the approach of the imperial armies that were to put an end to her political destinies. Antioch, the second Christian See in the order of time, might have succeeded her; but Antioch was too out of the way with respect to the rest of the empire; its sphere of influence was too limited. Rome was therefore chosen.

No doubt she was the capital of the empire, and many have tried thus to explain the pre-eminence of her Church. Let us look into this question. First of all, the ecclesiastical traditions, which agree in recognising in the Bishops of Rome the successors of the Apostle Peter, and, as such, in acknowledging their eminent prerogatives, have never once alluded to those prerogatives as the result of the fact that the Popes had their See in the capital, but always as being inherent in the office of successors and vicars of St. Peter. If there have been exceptions to this

way of viewing things, they are only to be found in the Byzantine world, and only there by way of invidious comparison, introduced since the time of Theodosius, between the Pontiffs of the new Rome and the Popes of the ancient one.

Then, even if it be true that the situation of Rome, as capital of the empire, contributed to increase the importance of its Church, have we not a right to see therein a means prepared by Divine Providence for assuring a centre to Christianity at its very inception? Believers all agree in seeing the finger of God in the marvellous history of the Roman Empire, and in the services which her peaceable institutions rendered to the propagation of the faith. Why should it not be allowed to us to perceive the designs of Providence in the selection of Rome as the abode of St. Peter and the See of his successors? ¹

3. Towards the year 97, the Church of Corinth was agitated by serious internal discords. The Church of Rome having heard of them, considered it to be her duty to interfere. It was not the Corinthians who begged her to do so; when she

¹ I regret to find in the encyclical letter of the Patriarch that the sojourn of St. Peter at Rome was classed among things that were doubtful, and that efforts were made to explain the universal tradition on this point by the apocryphal *pseudo-Clementines*. This system, contrary to the opinion admitted unto this day both in the Greek and in the Latin Churches, is derived from the lucubrations of F. C. Baur, of the rationalistic school of Tübingen. It is now abandoned by all scholars in Germany and elsewhere. Several of those who had allowed themselves to be led away by it, such as the illustrious Anglican, Bishop Lightfoot, have returned to the ancient tradition. Renan himself regretted the concessions he at first made to it. Is it not lamentable to see bishops thus accepting unsound theories, later on to be thrown aside, and abandoning the traditions of all their predecessors and of all the doctors of their own church? Can it be that they are thus led astray by passion?

bestirred herself, it was of her own accord and from consciousness of the duty imposed upon her by the circumstances. In her name, her bishop, Clement, wrote to the Church of Corinth a long letter, in which he accumulated exhortations to bring about concord and submission to the ecclesiastical authorities. This letter was carried to Corinth by three messengers, viz., Claudius Ephebus, Valerius Bito, and Fortunatus. It concludes in words well suited to give an idea of the tone of authority which pervades the whole document: "You will cause us great joy if, complying with what we have written to you in the Holy Spirit, you at once set aside the unjust excess of your anger, as we have exhorted you to do in recommending to you peace and concord by this letter. We have sent faithful and prudent men, who, from their youth up until their old age, have lived among us without reproach; they will be witnesses between you and us. If we act thus, it is because our only anxiety has been, and still is, to see your speedy return to peace."¹

Whether we consider this spontaneous act of Rome in itself or whether we weigh the terms of the letter, we cannot escape this impression—that, as early as the end of the first century of the Christian era, *i.e.* about fifty years after her foundation, the Roman Church was conscious of possessing supreme and exceptional authority, which she will never cease hereafter to claim. The Apostle John was still living at Ephesus at the time when Clement wrote. We find no trace of his intervention, nor of that of any of his friends. And yet communication was easier between Ephesus and Corinth than between Corinth and Rome.

¹ I. Clem., 58.

But how did the Corinthians receive the exhortations and the messengers of the Church of Rome? So well, that St. Clement's epistle was placed by them almost on a level with the Holy Scriptures. Seventy years later it was still read on Sundays in the assemblies of the faithful.¹

4. About twenty years after these events, St. Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, was carried to Rome as a prisoner, to be exposed to the wild beasts in the amphitheatre. From the coast of Asia he wrote to the Church of Rome. Let us see the tone in which he speaks. During his abode in Asia, he had already had reasons for writing to the illustrious Churches of Ephesus, Smyrna, Philadelphia, and others; the beginning of his letters always contained a number of laudatory epithets in honour of the Christian communities to whom he wrote. For the Church of Rome these epithets are more numerous and also more significant. Her pre-eminence is spoken of: "She presides in the country of the Romans; she presides at the love-feasts,"² or "the charities." If the martyr had been writing to the Bishop of Rome, these presidencies might be considered merely local in character, because, in his own diocese, the bishop always presides. But here there is no question of the bishop, but of the Church. Over what did the Roman Church preside? Was it merely over some other Churches, or dioceses, within a limited area? Ignatius had no idea of a limitation of that kind. Besides, were there in Italy any Christian communities distinct in their organisation from the community of Rome? The most natural meaning of such language is that the Roman Church presides

¹ Denis of Corinth, in Eusebius's *Eccl. Hist.*, iv. 23.

² Προκαθήμενη τῆς ἀγάπης.

over all the Churches. As the bishop in his diocese presides over its works of charity, so does the Roman Church preside over those same works throughout Christendom.¹

And let us remark that Ignatius speaks with a thorough knowledge of the matter; he knows the Church of Rome in the past, he even makes allusion to attitudes and acts, the remembrance of which is lost: "You have never led astray (or deceived²) any one; you have taught others. My will is that all that is prescribed by your teaching should remain uncontested."

Of what teaching, of what prescriptions, is there question here? We can hardly think he means the Letter to the Corinthians—that is too special a case; it is not even certain that Ignatius had any knowledge of it. We do not find him in contact with Corinth. Does he mean the *Pastor of Hermas*? It is very doubtful if that book had then been published. The simplest thing is to admit his recollection of some other acts and other documents, which were fresh in the mind of Ignatius, but which acts have since perished and been forgotten. In any case, the manner in which he speaks of the authority of the Roman Church in matters of doctrine, and of the prescriptions addressed by her to other Churches, is well worthy of attention.

5. I have just mentioned the *Pastor of Hermas*. From the tone of this book, we see that the visions it contains were received, not for Hermas alone, or only for the Romans, but for all the Churches; they

¹ That is precisely what M. Adolf Harnack acknowledges in an interesting paper read, on 6th February 1896, at the Academy of Berlin, but of which I only heard after the publication of this chapter.

² *Ad. Rom. 3.* Ἐβασκάνατε, the meaning of this word is a little obscure, but it corresponds pretty well to the translation I give.

are to be communicated to them all. And, indeed, the book of *Hermas* enjoyed universal notoriety and consideration in the primitive Church. Its credit fell later on, but not before the third century. For a hundred years after it had appeared, it was so much esteemed that, in certain places, it was actually ranked with the canonical books. A like honour was attributed to the Epistle of St. Clement.

However, if we set aside the books which, rightly or wrongly, bear on their title-page the names of Apostles, the Letter¹ of Clement and the *Pastor of Hermas* are the only works which have thus been esteemed, in certain Churches of the East, being included either in the canon or in its appendices. That extraordinary honour paid to two Roman authors is quite worthy of remark. Later on, a similar consideration was attached to a book, true or fictitious, attributed to a third Roman, St. Hippolytus. One of the canonical collections of the Coptic Church contains a certain number of the canons of Hippolytus of Rome.

6. As regards Clement, one might point out other traces of the great esteem in which his memory was held in the East. I say in the East, for the West hardly perceived that halo of glory, save by translations from the Greek made somewhat later, *i.e.* since the beginning of the fifth century. It was in Syria, before the time of Origen (that is, towards the end of the second century), that the famous story of the perigrinations of St. Peter from Jerusalem to Antioch was composed. In this story, Clement plays one of the principal parts; he is the companion of St. Peter,

¹ I ought to say the *Letters*, for the Homily generally called "the Second Epistle of St. Clement to the Corinthians" was treated like the first as soon as the name of Clement had been attached to it.

his chosen disciple, his witness, and his helper in the struggle against Simon Magus. Besides, it is he who is supposed to be the author of the book. Among the papers annexed to the principal composition, a letter of his, addressed to James, Bishop of Jerusalem, relates in detail how, before his martyrdom, the Apostle Peter had presented Clement to the faithful in Rome as being destined to govern the Church after his death.

Another Syrian composition of the third century, but retouched in the following one, called the *Apostolical Constitutions*, has preserved for us a record of the discipline and liturgy of those ancient times, under the form of prescriptions derived from the Apostles. The Apostles are supposed to hold a great council, in which each one draws up his prescriptions on such or such a point of ecclesiastical discipline. They are not alone; Clement is with them: he assists them as secretary, it is to him they confide the duty of promulgating their decrees.

The same office of secretary and interpreter of the Apostles is assigned to Clement in a composition similar to the preceding one, and still more ancient, that of the *Ecclesiastical Canons*, which figures at the head of one of the books of Egyptian ecclesiastical law. The same thing is to be remarked in the celebrated collection called *Canons of the Apostles*, which at the Council of Trullo (692) was inserted in the code of the Byzantine Church. Identically the same idea always prevails. Clement, successor of St. Peter in the See of Rome, is the most accredited witness of apostolical tradition; the Apostles have charged him to give it form in writing and to communicate it to the Churches.

And let me not be reproached for making use

of apocryphal documents. I know very well that those documents have but an historical value of little or no weight. But they exist; they were composed in the third and fourth centuries, not in the Latin ecclesiastical world, but in the East; those who edited them would not have presented Clement as the disciple, secretary, and successor of the Apostles if they had not held a very high idea of the authority attached to his name and to his position in the hierarchy. It is that idea upon which I lay stress and of which I take advantage. One might say, strictly speaking, that it may have been suggested by a passage from the *Pastor*, where Clement seems to be represented as charged with the correspondence between the Church of Rome and the other Churches. But from that to the extraordinary part attributed to him, both in the *Clementines* and in the divers *Apostolical Constitutions*, the distance is very great. Such an explanation would evidently be insufficient.

7. Thus the East voluntarily placed its rules of discipline under the patronage of the ancient Roman Church. Serious indications, much more important than the compositions I have just spoken of, allow us to attribute to the Roman Church the compilation of the most ancient of the creeds.¹

¹ One might say as much of the formation of the New Testament. Upon this point, however, I abstain from entering into details. To do so would lead me too far. Nevertheless, the demonstration for which M. Adolf Harnack has collected divers elements in his *Dogmengeschichte*, tom. i. p. 363, cannot have its full value unless we take into account the fact of the exceptional influence of the Roman Church in the second century. As that is precisely the fact I wish to establish here, I think I ought to avoid all appearance of begging the question. But for my part, I think with M. Harnack that the books of the New Testament were put together at Rome, after an understanding with the Churches of Asia.

As early as the middle of the second century, at the very least, the Roman Church possessed a rule of faith which was to be recited at baptism, which the baptized bound themselves to profess all their lives, and which served as a test or rule of faith for all, viz., the Apostles' Creed. The writings of Irenæus and Tertullian show it to be not only existing in their day but in possession of its full doctrinal authority. It is only found in the East later on, and first of all in the writings of Origen in the following generation. It was completed there in different ways, as it was also in the West; but the substance of the Creed remains everywhere the same. It is clear that a formula so explicit could not have been drawn up in the same terms in different countries. It has a birthplace, and Rome is the one indicated by chronological proofs.¹

8. It is from Rome again that we have the most anciently attested among the lists of bishops. Sooner than elsewhere, it seems, care was taken to give to the idea of apostolical succession this significant expression. Though they are of great interest, the lists of the Bishops of Antioch and Alexandria are only attested by the use made of them by Eusebius at the beginning of the fourth century; the Roman list is found in St. Irenæus, and it existed some time before the end of the second century.

9. St. Irenæus was right in saying that the Church of Rome was "known to all." It is wonderful indeed to see visitors flocking thither from all countries of the world during the second century. Some are sincere Christians who intend remaining firmly rooted in the ancient faith, and who under-

¹ See the discussion of these latter in the erudite work of Caspari, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols*, tom. iii.

take the journey to Rome for purposes of edification. St. Justin comes from the Greek part of Palestine; Hegesippus from the Syrian part; Tatian from Assyria; Abercius Marcellus from Phrygia. Asia, above all, furnishes a remarkable contingent of travellers, of whom some pass on, others remain. St. Polycarp, at that time more than eighty years of age, does not hesitate to transport himself from Smyrna for the purpose of arranging the question long since pending between the Church of Rome and the Churches of Asia regarding the Easter observance. After him we must mention Irenæus himself, the future Bishop of Lyons. In the following generation, Origen undertakes the journey to Rome solely with "the desire of seeing that very ancient Church." In Africa, Tertullian has his mind constantly preoccupied about the Church of Rome, whether he puts her forward as an authority against the Gnostic heresies, or whether, having become a Montanist and a rigorist, he pursues her with his bitter invective. As to the Christian community of Carthage, already so important, he does not seem to care much about it; the centre of authority and of Catholic guidance he places at Rome and not in Africa.

10. The heretics are not less numerous. They also are attracted by the importance of the Roman community, where they hope to recruit disciples. Some of them went further; they formed the design of getting into their hands the direction of the affairs of the Church. This is certain in the case of Marcion, perhaps also in that of Valentinian. Marcion came from Pontus, Valentinian from Egypt, from whence, under the episcopacy of Anicetus, there arrived another celebrated heretic, Marcellinus,

teacher of the Carpocratian sect. The Syrian, Cerdon, had sojourned there before Marcion himself. All these sowers of cockle among the wheat managed, it is true, to lead away some few weak minds; but they came into collision with the vigilance of the heads of the Church, whom they vainly tried to deceive by false protestations or pretended conversions. It is clear that they cling to Rome so as to profit by the influence of that great Christian centre for the success of their enterprises. In the time of St. Irenæus, a Gnostic doctor, Florinus, managed to dissimulate so completely that they gave him a place in their ecclesiastical college. The latter were Gnostics. At the end of the second century, we see other heretical celebrities arrive. The doctrine that will be condemned later on in the persons of Paul of Samosata and Photinus created much stir in Rome, through the influence of Theodotus of Byzantium.¹ About the same time, Praxeas and Epigonus came from Asia to open a school of modalistic theology, the system to which the name of Sabellius has remained attached. The Montanists also showed themselves there, and, a little later on, the Elkasaites of Syria, represented by a certain Alcibiades. It seems as if the East could not give birth to any heresy without feeling at once the need of bringing it upon the scene in Rome. That was sure to procure for it a prompt and signal condemnation. Valentinian, Cerdon, and Marcion were excluded from the Church of Rome as soon as they had made themselves known; it was the same with regard to Theodotus of Byzantium, Sabellius, and many others.

¹ This Theodotus is the most ancient Byzantine Christian with whom we are acquainted.

The Montanists of Phrygia tried for a long time to gain over the authority of the Church of Rome to their heresy. In their own country they had met with very lively opposition. Nevertheless their prophecies and their austerities led many people astray. From Lyons the martyrs of 177 appealed to Pope Eleutherius in their favour. Ten years later, St. Irenæus treated them leniently in his treatise on heresies. In Rome, always so faithful to tradition, there was hesitation as to the use of rigour against the prophesyings and Paraclitus. The affair dragged on until the beginning of the third century. A last effort of the agents of the Montanists seemed at first, says Tertullian, to have won the approbation of Pope Zephyrinus. To urge him to a decision, they quoted documents come down from his predecessors, *auctoritates præcessorum ejus*.¹ But Zephyrinus drew back in time, and instead of supporting the Montanist movement, he solemnly condemned it.

From this history, the details of which remain obscure, it may be gathered that the Phrygian agitation found an echo at Rome, that the leaders of the movement, though repudiated by many bishops of their own country, did not consider themselves compromised beyond hope; that documents (*auctoritates*) written in the name of the Bishop of Rome obtained for them at first sight a certain amount of credit; that, later on, the character of the new prophecy having become better known, it received a positive condemnation from the same authority which until then had maintained a more reserved attitude.

Besides, if the condemnation was delayed, it

¹ Tertullian, *Adv. Praxeam*, i.

must be remarked that from the origin of the movement in the pontificate of Eleutherius, the Church of Rome had been drawn into it. Montanism at first was but a local affair, interesting only to the Churches of Phrygia and Asia. If the martyrs of Lyons were alarmed at it in 177, it was precisely because many important members of their Church were Asiatics or Phrygians. Even at the time when Tertullian wrote against Praxeas, the question, at least for the Pope, had as yet only a purely Asiatic character. It was discussed far from Rome by letters sent backwards and forwards in Asia and Phrygia.¹

In proceeding thus, the Popes interfered in a debate which did not directly concern their own Church. It was a repetition of the affair at Corinth in A.D. 97.

11. Nor is it the only one. How instructive is the dispute about Easter in the time of Pope Victor (about A.D. 190). Two recognised customs are found to be in contradiction to each other: that of Rome, followed nearly everywhere, ordered the Christian Easter to be observed on the Sunday after the Jewish Passover (or Pasch); the custom of the Asiatic province accepted the Jewish Pasch for the date of the Christian feast. The Asiatics claimed for themselves the highest authorities: the Apostles John and Philip, their disciples Papias and Polycarp, and some celebrated prophets and martyrs. Their Churches are famous throughout Christendom, their tradition is universally esteemed. Rome, however, did not yield. She also had her tradition, which was manifested precisely by her opposition to the Asiatic custom, and which existed since the

¹ Tertullian, *loc. cit.*

days of Trajan and Adrian. It was in vain that the venerable Polycarp came as far as Rome to arrange that matter; he was unable to convince Pope Anicetus. Under his successor, Soter, negotiations became less friendly. Victor determined to decide the question, but first of all he submitted it to the other Churches. At his request the bishops assembled in every country of the Empire and even beyond it. They took cognisance of the case and sent the result of their deliberations to Rome. All these Councils, except the Council of Asia, were favourable to the Roman custom. This is significant; we see how difficult it was, even for Churches like those of St. John, to compete with the tradition of Rome. At the end of the second century the Roman custom for the celebration of Easter was accepted nearly everywhere.

But the most important thing in the first period of the quarrel is the convocation of the Councils. All were held at the invitation of Pope Victor, even the Council of Asia. Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus, who writes in the name of that Council,¹ and who upholds its opinion with the greatest zeal, recognises expressly that, if he gathered his colleagues together, it was at the request of Rome. Does one see claims of this kind made by any other Church? Where are the Bishops of Antioch, of Ephesus, or of Alexandria, who ever conceived the idea of convoking thus the whole episcopate from Gaul to Pontus, Osroëne, and Palestine? This initiative of Pope Victor alone, an initiative proved to be effective, suffices to show how evident in those ancient times was the exceptional situation and the oecumenical authority of the Roman Church.

¹ Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, v. 24.

But let us continue the story. The Asiatics resisted. They protested that they would never give up their tradition. Victor then proceeded against them by excommunication. He cut them off from "the common union," τῆς κοινῆς ἐνώσεως, is the expression of Eusebius. The Pope is, therefore, conscious that he, as head of the Church of Rome, is the guardian of universal communion, that it is in his power not only to break off his intercourse with any ecclesiastical body, but to separate that body itself from the unity of the whole Church. What term are we to make use of if we are forbidden to apply the title of "Head of the Church" to one who is depositary of such plenary authority?

St. Irenæus, it is true, and other bishops with him, thought that Pope Victor's severity was excessive, and they let him know it. This has been used as an argument against the authority of the See of Rome, as if the Church of Rome were inaccessible to advice, as if, even in our days, the Pope were not always ready to listen to the warnings of his colleagues in the episcopate. It is possible that Victor had, indeed, gone beyond what was strictly just. I say this with reserve, for we have only very incomplete information about this affair, and especially we have not the documents which came from the Pope himself. However that may be, and however Victor may have been blamed by certain bishops, one point is henceforth clear—the Asiatics gave up their custom, not after the Council of Nice, as is still often repeated, but a very long time before it. The dispute about Easter, which was settled at Nice, concerned the Churches of Antioch and Alexandria. From the beginning of the fourth century, those who held to the old

custom of Asia were represented in their own country by a small schismatical sect, and not by the legitimate episcopate. The latter was in perfect agreement, as regards the date of Easter, with Rome and Alexandria.¹ In whatever degree the severe measures of Pope Victor may have been applied or maintained, they were followed by the complete submission of the Asiatics.

12. A similar conflict, the issue of which, however, was a little different, arose in 256 between Pope Stephen and the Church of Africa. The head of the latter Church, St. Cyprian, cannot be accused of hostility towards the Church of Rome. His intercourse with her was incessant; in his letters, and in his other works he always shows the greatest respect for the "chair of Peter" and for the "sovereign (*principalis*) Church from which proceeds the unity of the episcopate." As to Pope Stephen personally, it is clear from different circumstances that Cyprian did not revere him personally so much as his predecessors. They had come into collision on other points, and disagreed on the subject of baptism conferred by heretics. Such baptism was recognised as valid at Rome, but set aside as void at Carthage. These divergencies of custom might be justified by doctrinal arguments; at that time they were regarded, not as a question of faith, but of discipline.²

¹ I have discussed this question at length in the *Revue des questions historiques*, July 1880.

² We must notice that it was nearly always the same when there was a question of determining what heretics were to be re-baptized and what heretics were only to be re-confirmed. The Greek and Russian Churches, for instance, have varied much in the treatment to which they submitted Latins converted to "orthodoxy." After the Latins had been driven from Constantinople in 1260, and after the rupture which took place at Florence in 1484, they confined themselves to re-confirming. In 1629, the Russian Church,

Cyprian, supported by all the African bishops, who assembled in council under his presidency, and by a letter from Firmilian, Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, one of the most illustrious of the Eastern prelates, resolved to maintain his custom. Stephen had, however, threatened excommunication. Did he carry out his threat? We know not. In any case, the Africans saw in this dispute no reason for disunion, and forbore to disturb the concord of the Church. Moreover, neither they nor Firmilian denied the authority of the Apostolic See; but went only so far as to think and to affirm that the question contained an element of abuse.

The successors of Stephen, to begin with the celebrated martyr Sixtus II., did not maintain the rigours announced or proclaimed. The rupture, if it was really consummated, lasted only a few months. Stephen died on the 2nd of August 257. His successor, Sixtus, lived on good terms with Cyprian, to whom his biographer gives the title of a good and peaceful bishop. Shortly after, towards 260, messengers from Rome brought to the Christians of Cæsarea, suffering from an invasion of barbarians, alms and words of consolation. The letters of St.

which until then had followed this system, imposed the renewal of baptism. But the Patriarchs of Constantinople, Nicon and Joasaph, in 1655 and in 1667, in agreement with the other Greek Patriarchs of the East, brought her back to the ancient custom. In 1718, both in Russia and in the Greek patriarchates, even the baptism of Lutherans and Calvinists was admitted. There was a change again in 1756 when the four Patriarchs declared the baptism of the Western Church to be "invalid," on the pretext that it is not given by immersion. Lastly, [since about the year 1860, the Synod of Athens, as well as the patriarchate of Constantinople, again decided that confirmation alone should be repeated. It is clear that, in thus modifying their custom for baptism, the Orientals did not intend to vary in their faith. I borrow this information from Mr. W. Birkbeck, *Russia and the English Church*, tom. i. p. 63.

Denis of Alexandria¹ agree with these facts, proving that the dissension did not survive Pope Stephen. However, neither the Africans nor the Orientals had given up their custom; it was only in the fourth century that, little by little, it was brought into conformity with that of Rome, and the divergence was left to dissident sects, the Donatists and the Arians.

13. These disputes regard questions of rites. Others concern questions of faith, and particularly that part of our doctrine which is now called "Christology."

We have already seen that, from the time of Popes Victor, Zephyrinus, and Callistus (189–222), the Church of Rome had intervened to condemn the heresy of Theodotus of Byzantium, which was causing scandal at Rome. By the side of this school, another, that of the Modalists (or Patripassians), escaped for a time the censures of ecclesiastical authority. It was so easy, with a little artfulness of language, to give to that teaching an appearance of orthodoxy! In the fourth century it again met with success. The illustrious Athanasius very reluctantly made up his mind to recognise in Marcellus of Ancyra a dangerous ally. At Rome, Pope Callistus, after divers attempts to lead back Sabellius, the head of that school, into the right path, decided on excommunicating him. The author of the *Philosophumena*, who does all he can to implicate Callistus in the cause of Sabellius, is nevertheless obliged to declare that it was Callistus who pronounced the condemnation. It was, he said, "to avoid being blamed by the other Churches." With such idle disputes and imputations of motives, history is not concerned. Spite of this kind, however,

¹ Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, vii. 5.

is but another token of the great notoriety of the Roman Church, and of the extreme deference paid to all her proceedings.

14. But it was not only to events taking place within her own bosom that the Church of Rome paid attention. It is well known that Origen had serious difficulties with Demetrius, Bishop of Alexandria. Between them there were disputes on points of discipline. Although the singular audacity of his teaching had raised up much opposition after his death, and had been remarked upon by a few even in his lifetime, we do not find that any ecclesiastical authority in the East ever called Origen to account on the subject of his teaching. But towards the end of his career he was obliged to justify himself before Pope Fabian and to retract certain propositions.¹

15. Origen was but a very influential theologian, and one much before the public. His disciple and former fellow-labourer, Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria, was, on the contrary, the head of a Church, and that a very important one. Must it be recalled here, how, being too much imbued with the doctrines of his master, and carried away by the ardour of his controversy against the Sabellians, he went so far as to let fall some propositions touching the inferiority of the Eternal Word, which led the Arians to boast of him as an ancestor? His propositions and his writings having been denounced to Rome by the faithful of his diocese, Pope Dionysius wrote the very serious and eloquent letter from which St. Athanasius has preserved a long quotation, and which is one of the most valuable documents of Christian theology anterior to the Council of Nice. With much modera-

¹ Eusebius, vi. 36; St. Jerome, *Ep.* 84; Rufinus, *Hieronymum*, i. 44.

tion of language, the Bishop of Alexandria is there reminded of the orthodox tradition on the Holy Trinity, he is even asked not to reject the term *consubstantial*, which had already been brought into use, at least at Rome, though it was not to become classical till the following century. Besides this long admonition, in which, I think, he was not actually named, Dionysius of Alexandria received from Rome an invitation to explain himself in the matters of which he was accused. He did so, he modified his language and brought his teaching into conformity with tradition, meriting thus to be defended by St. Athanasius against the claims of the Arians.¹

This legitimate interference of the Church of Rome in the doctrinal affairs of the Church of Alexandria in no way altered the friendly intercourse that existed between the two Sees. Before that incident as well as after, during the persecutions of Decius and Valerian, in the midst of the long siege of the Bruchium, during the crisis raised by the schism of Novatian, and during the baptismal controversy, we always find Dionysius in correspondence with the succeeding Popes who occupied the chair of St. Peter, and even with members of their clergy.² The Church of Alexandria was as much mixed up as that of Carthage with the ecclesiastical circle in Rome. Dionysius is really a second Cyprian; he shows himself even more conciliatory than the latter, and more ready to yield to the exhortations addressed to him.

16. Let us hasten on now to a more consoling

¹ St. Athanasius, *De decretis Nicænæ synodi*, c. xxvi. : *De sententia Dionysii*.

² Among forty-seven letters or treatises known to have been written by him, about eighteen are addressed to Rome.

subject than that of conflicts concerning doctrines, prophecies, rites, and discipline. It was not merely owing to the superior authority of her tradition that the Church of Rome was known and esteemed. For the faithful in general, her most striking pre-eminence was the pre-eminence of her charity. Let the ecclesiastical disputes of every country resound in Rome ; what most easily found a hearing there were the sufferings of the other Churches. Rome was at once affected by even the most distant calamities, whether caused by ordinary adversities, by the scourge of war, or by persecution. Messengers were sent off in her name to console the afflicted, and to carry them abundant alms. Such was her constant tradition. At the time of the Emperor Marcus Aurelius, Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, bears witness to this in a letter to Pope Soter : “ It has been, from the beginning, an established custom with you to load with favours all the faithful, to send supplies to a number of Churches in every country. Thus you relieve the misery of those who are in want, you bestow alms on those of our brethren who are condemned to the mines, and maintain thus the tradition which you, Romans, have received from the Romans your predecessors.”¹

After the persecutions of Decius and Gallus, Dionysius of Alexandria² reminds Pope Stephen of the letter which the Church of Rome had just written, and of the assistance she had so constantly sent to “ all the Churches of Syria³ and Arabia.” Two years later the Goths and the Borans invaded Pontus, penetrated into Cappadocia, and sacked the great city of Cæsarea. Firmilian was still bishop

¹ Eusebius, iv. 9.

² Eusebius, vii. 5.

³ Cælo-Syria, Syria in Phœnicia, Syria in Palestine.

there. No one at Rome remembered the way in which he had spoken but a short time previously about Pope Stephen. The treasury of the Church, exhausted by the generous sacrifice of its arch-deacon, St. Lawrence, had scarcely had time to be refilled. No matter! Cæsarea was suffering, and money must be found for Cæsarea. "We know," writes St. Basil¹ to Pope Damasus, "both by the recollection of our forefathers and also by letters which have been preserved among us, how Dionysius, that Pontiff of blessed memory, who was as illustrious for the rectitude of his faith as for his other virtues, formerly came to the help of our Church of Cæsarea; that he consoled us by his letters, sending at the same time persons charged with ransoming our brethren who had been taken captive."

That charitable custom lasted as long as the persecutions. Eusebius attests that it was still in vigour during the time of Diocletian and Maximian (304-312). A few facts only have come down to us, but it is clear, from the manner in which they are stated, that they represent many others of the same kind. It is, so to speak, an œcumenical charity, verifying the words of St. Ignatius, "the Church of Rome, pre-eminent in charity."

III

Thus all the Churches throughout the known world, from Arabia, Osrhœne, and Cappadocia to the extreme west, felt the incessant influence of Rome in every respect, whether as to faith, discipline, administration, ritual, or works of charity. She

¹ *Ep.* 70.

was, as St. Irenæus says, "known everywhere and respected everywhere, and her guidance was universally accepted." No competitor, no rival stands up against her; no one conceives the idea of being her equal. Later on there will be patriarchs and other local primates, whose first beginnings can be but vaguely perceived during the course of the third century. Above these rising organisations, and above the whole body of isolated Churches, the Church of Rome rises in supreme majesty, the Church of Rome represented by the long series of her bishops, which ascends to the two chiefs of the Apostolic College; she knows herself to be, and is considered by all, the centre and the organ of unity.¹

Her position is so evident that even pagans themselves remark it if they do but turn their attention in any way to the organisation of Christianity. The emperors in particular are better able to appreciate it than others; it is even a necessary part of their government to study it. In 272 the Emperor Aurelian was suddenly called upon to decide a serious dispute which was dividing the Christians of Antioch. The bishop of that city, Paul of Samosata, had, by his teaching and by his conduct, incurred the loss of his See. The sentence was pronounced in a great Council held by the neighbouring bishops, and communicated to the heads of the

¹ Even distant Edessa felt her influence, and sought connection with her. Pope Victor convoked a council at Osrhœne towards the year 195. According to the local tradition, Palut, the first bishop after the two founders Addaï and Aggaï, had been ordained by Serapion, Bishop of Antioch, who himself had received consecration from the hands of Zephyrinus, Bishop of Rome, and successor of St. Peter (*Doctrina Addaei*, see end; cf. Cureton, *Ancient Syriac Documents*, pp. 41 and 63).

Churches of Rome and Alexandria. But Paul made light of his condemnation, and continued to reside in the bishop's house, from which the new bishop sought to expel him. The affair was brought before the emperor. It was a novel situation for a pagan prince. Between two bishops, each declaring that he was in the right, how was he to decide? "He settled the question in the most reasonable way," says Eusebius, "by ordering that the bishop's house should be given over to the one accepted, by reason of his doctrine, and the letters of the Bishops of Italy and of the city of Rome."¹ A century later Theodosius acted in a similar manner, when he declared that he only considered as legitimate those bishops who were in communion with Damasus of Rome and Peter of Alexandria.

I must conclude this study of facts with the last part of the third century. After that date, ecclesiastical history becomes, for a time, very obscure. Excepting the events of the great persecution, it tells us very little until we come to the schism of the Donatists in the West, and the troubles caused by Arius in the East. The details which I have collected and classified here are taken mostly from one book, the *Ecclesiastical History* of Eusebius, which, in spite of the author's painstaking, is far from satisfying the demands of our curiosity. Other facts are borrowed from contemporary writings, such as those of St. Irenæus, Tertullian, and St. Cyprian. All these works, except those of St. Cyprian, were very little known in Rome during the fourth century. Those of

¹ Eusebius, vii. 31. To the emperor it was evident that, between the Bishops of Italy and the Bishop of Rome no divergence was to be expected, otherwise he would have been more explicit.

Eusebius were only read there later on in the pitiful translation of Rufinus; the writings of Clement and Irenæus, even in the Latin versions, soon became literary rarities. The same may be said of Tertullian. We have seen that Cyprian, while using the most respectful language, gives the example of a very marked attachment to autonomy. It is not, therefore, from literature that the Romans, at the end of the fourth century and the beginning of the next, sought to prove the authority of their Church. Damasus (366) and his successors Zosimus, Boniface, and Celestine (417-432), whose words manifest such great confidence in the prerogatives of their See, had not at their disposal the documents which enable us now to appeal to Christian antiquity. By the side of a very vague literary tradition, almost effaced, they had hardly any other arguments to adduce but the tomb of St. Peter, their succession from him, and the testimony of the Gospels. More fortunate than they were, we can now prove by historical documents that they were right; that the pompous style of certain pontifical letters is no vain pretension, but merely an exaggerated expression of the true primitive tradition.

I said above that the Byzantines of the ninth century did not complain of the supremacy of the Pope. The Roman Church indeed caused them no uneasiness; if they had abstained from picking a quarrel with her, she would no doubt have continued to leave them in peace. Even at the present day, it is probable that, if reunion should take place, the most liberal autonomy would be granted to them. However, between the feudal papacy, which ends with Benedict IX. (1033), and the reforming papacy which comes into view with Hildebrand and asserts itself

under Gregory VII. (1073),¹ there is undoubtedly a remarkable difference; a difference great enough to explain why, on this account, a new protestation should be added to the one formerly made at Constantinople. It would be both incorrect and out of place to deny such a change.

But, if I am ready to acknowledge it, I am not less convinced that the active, reforming, and organising policy inaugurated by Gregory VII. is guaranteed not only by right but by tradition. Let us for a moment suppose Popes Clement, Victor, Dionysius, and others reappearing during the tenth or eleventh century in the midst of ecclesiastical Rome; they would not have understood the situation. They would have inquired, "Where is the East?" and they might have been shown the way thither by a road so obstructed by bogs and thorns that it was most difficult to travel by it. The West, which was more accessible, would only appear as the scene of scandals. Recall them to life, on the contrary, two centuries later and they would find themselves no doubt little at home, but at least their successor would no longer appear to them under the double aspect of an officiating minister in a great cathedral, and an administrator of important temporal concerns. They would find in him what they had been themselves—a true Head of the Church. Still less than their predecessors of the fifth century had the Popes who followed Gregory VII. a clear idea of remote ecclesiastical antiquity. Their casuists, it is true, produced many proofs venerable by their antiquity, if they had only been authentic; but they were, in reality, misleading both to themselves and to the public. The false

¹ See *Hildebrand, the Napoleon of the Church*, 3 vols: A. H. Mathew.

Decretals are now discredited, and the early defenders of the Holy See are blamed for having made use of them. If the Patriarch Anthimius is to be believed, the whole edifice of papal supremacy reposes upon them. This is unjust and monstrous. In reality, the false Decretals were only a temporary argument, defective in itself, but made use of in all the sincerity of good intentions. In any case, it was not from these documents that Gregory VII. derived his keen appreciation of the miseries which afflicted the Church, nor his conviction that the Pope, as successor of St. Peter, could still wield great moral force if he were free, disinterested, and faithful to his duty. He well knew that such had been the sentiments of the great Popes of bygone days, such as St. Leo, St. Gregory, and others, and in their examples he found hope and support. Better informed than we could have been in his time, we now see how, far beyond the time of those illustrious Pontiffs, he went back to a still earlier and more venerable tradition, to that of the Popes of the primitive Church, to the epoch when, in spite of her material insecurity, she was not hindered in her spiritual activity; when the emperors, if not yet her sons, were nevertheless not her oppressors.

When Gregory was raised to the See of St. Peter, the East was no longer spoken of; the road thither had been forgotten for centuries. How this had come to pass, is now the question which remains for us to study.

CHAPTER V

THE GREEK CHURCH AND THE GREEK SCHISM

IN the preceding chapter I tried to call the attention of my readers to the perfect union existing among the early Christians, to their frequent intercourse with Rome, to the exceptional position which was hers, as a centre of authority of guidance and of action. During that golden age of Christianity there was really but one heart and one soul in a single body. But during the following centuries we no longer see that beautiful, smooth, and salutary union. Already we may perceive certain roughnesses which become more and more evident; soon sharp edges and fissures arise, until at last we come to the great rupture of the eleventh century.

We must now concentrate our attention on this last stage of the great separation. The accomplishment of the schism had been prepared for, for centuries past; people had become used to the idea of a definitive isolation. I may say, indeed, that it had been attempted several times. From the accession of Constantine to the empire of the East (323) until the seventh Œcumenical Council (787),—that is to say, during a space of four hundred and sixty-four years—I count no less than two hundred and three years during which, either the whole of the East (comprising also Egypt and Illyricum) or only the regions depending upon Antioch and Constantinople—that is to say, the “imperial Church”

—remained in schism, *i.e.* out of communion with the Apostolic See. Let us make a calculation :—

1. On account of St. Athanasius and Arianism, from the Council of Sardica (343) until the succession of St. John Chrysostom to the See of Constantinople (343–398)	55 years
2. About the condemnation of Chrysostom (404– 415)	11 „
3. With regard to Acacius and the Henotikon of Zeno (484–519)	35 „
4. On account of Monothelism (640–681)	41 „
5. On account of veneration of images (726–787) .	61 „
<hr/>	
Total	203 years

And I have omitted certain slight ruptures which were only transitory. Thus, during the five centuries which followed the persecutions, the Greek Church passed nearly half of her time out of communion with Rome and in schism. How different from her condition in the primitive ages!

Nor was that all. If the last three schisms finally calmed down, it was much more because the emperors willed it to be so, and willed it with insistence, than because the Greek clergy spontaneously aspired to reconciliation and unity. They accepted communion with Rome rather than they sought for it.

How could this have come about? How could the deep feeling of solidarity which existed universally before Constantine have become thus weakened? That is what we are now about to endeavour to elucidate.

I

During the first three centuries of Christendom, a denomination such as the Greek Church would have been impossible and incomprehensible. I do not mean that in the present day it is an official title; but when we speak of the "Greek Church" we mean something definite. The Patriarch Anthimius prefers the term of *Church of the Seven Œcumenical Councils*, which, as we have seen, can hardly be justified. In any case, there exists outside the pale of the Church of Rome, and exclusive of the Nestorian and Monophysite Churches which fell away in the sixth century, an important ecclesiastical group, which we mean to designate when we employ the term "Greek Church." All those who compose it do not speak Greek; far from that, the greater number are Slavs who, even in their liturgy, make use of their national languages. Unity is far from existing among them. A dozen minor groups may be counted, forming national Churches, or provinces, having individual heads holding but little intercourse with each other. Many of these subdivisions, and the most important of them, are formed of nations converted in the ninth and tenth centuries. They joined the patriarchates of the Eastern Empire, relatively the most ancient nucleus of all that formation. One alone of those four patriarchates presents the imposing form of an edifice. Those of Alexandria and Antioch are but the merest façades since the sixth century, and the little patriarchate of Jerusalem has almost disappeared, being absorbed by Islamism. There remains the patriarchate of Constantinople, considerably re-

duced in strength by the Turks in Asia Minor and by the Bulgarians in Thrace.

In Justinian's time and after him, we often meet with the opinion that the Church is presided over by five Patriarchs, and this notion has been kept up by Byzantine law. At Rome it was accepted in official language, but without enthusiasm, as being a novelty, and in her own documents there is no mention of five Sees before the pontificate of Vigilius (537-555), when the Byzantine restoration took place in Italy, and many endeavours were made by the imperial court to regulate ecclesiastical affairs. St. Gregory the Great announced his accession to the four Patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. That did not prevent him from keeping up, in his private correspondence, the old notion of three Patriarchs (Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch) seated on the same "chair of St. Peter."

This notion, which I qualify as ancient, may be traced back to the Council of Chalcedon; it is a sort of protest against the patriarchates of Constantinople and Jerusalem, which were founded by that Council, but which were received very coldly by the Holy See. Nor was her protest the only one. In the struggle for or against the maintenance of the Council of Chalcedon this question of hierarchy had its place side by side with the question of faith. The Metropolitans of Cæsarea and Ephesus, who were particularly wronged by the foundation of the Byzantine patriarchate, were the first to offer opposition. The heretical Patriarch of Alexandria, Timothy Ælurus, managed (475) to get the Bishop of Ephesus to join with him against the Council, by restoring to him his position as Patriarch, of

which dignity the Council had deprived his predecessors. This circumstance decided the attitude assumed by Acacius, Patriarch of Constantinople, who immediately took up the defence of the Council of Chalcedon. Later on, however, Acacius found a means of shifting the question by abandoning the dogmatical decrees of the Council without giving up any of the prerogatives¹ belonging to the See of Constantinople. In this manner, all resistance at length calmed down; the new patriarchates were henceforth regarded in the East as a matter of course. Justinian eventually obtained their acceptance at Rome.

In fact, neither the system of five Patriarchs, nor that of three great Apostolic Sees, represents any idea conceived in the primitive Church. We never hear of the "three Sees" before Constantine. The Council of Nice defined clearly the rights of the See of Alexandria over the episcopate of Egypt; less clearly those of the See of Antioch; it never caused it to be understood that those two Sees, united or not with the See of Rome, constituted a legitimate authority, charged with the ecclesiastical government, either of the whole Church or of only the Churches comprised in the Eastern half of the Roman Empire. Besides, this supposed commission of three, or of five, great primates represents in no way the Greek Church, considered as distinct from, or as a rival of the Latin Church; it is rather a symbol of what was still remaining of ecclesiastical unity from the decline of the fifth century.

The centre of attraction that caused the special coalition to which the Greek Church owes its origin is the emperor with his court. Previous to the

¹ Evagrius, *H. E.*, iii. 6, 7, 13, 14.

fourth century, in the provinces of the East which were situated beyond the range of the Latin tongue, we find only three ecclesiastical groups having some sort of individuality: that of proconsular Asia, which soon lost its original autonomy; that of Egypt, already known for its narrow spirit in the third century, and becoming more and more remarkable for its "particularism"; and, thirdly, Antioch. This latter group comprised, from the middle of the third century, all the bishoprics of Eastern Asia Minor, which were soon united as the diocese of Pontus. As early as the year 251, we hear of a Synod which was to be held at Antioch, Fabius, bishop of that city, appearing to incline to Novatianism. The promoters of this assembly were the Bishops of Tarsus, of Cæsarea in Palestine, and of Cæsarea in Cappadocia.¹ A few years after, in 256, Dionysius of Alexandria,² speaking of the Churches of the East which had been agitated by that conflict, names those of Antioch, Cæsarea in Palestine, Ælia (Jerusalem), Tyre, Laodicea in Syria, Tarsus, and Cæsarea in Cappadocia. A little later, from 264 to 268, the affair of Paul of Samosata caused several meetings of bishops at Antioch in order to protect the interests of that Church. They always came from the same provinces: extending from Pontus Polemoniacus (Neocæsarea) to Arabia (Bos-tra and to Palestine (Cæsarea, Ælia). Immediately after the persecution of Galerius and Maximinus, a celebrated Council at Ancyra, presided over by the Bishop of Antioch, brought together fifteen bishops from the same countries. This time the provinces of Bithynia, Phrygia, and Pamphylia were repre-

¹ Eusebius, viii. 44.

² Ibid., vii. 5.

sented ; but Asia, properly so called, still remained apart.¹

Antioch was, therefore, earlier than Asia and Egypt the most important ecclesiastical centre, the one which was most willingly chosen as a rallying point. That tendency began to vary as soon as there existed out of Antioch a Christian court and a court-bishop. The latter becoming naturally the counsellor, the confidential director of princes or princesses, his influence, little by little, predominated over all other influences in the Eastern Churches. Already under Licinius and Constantine, Eusebius, Bishop of Nicomedia, was more powerful than his colleague of Antioch. The latter regained his prestige under Constantius, precisely because the court was transferred to Antioch, but when once the seat of the empire was definitively fixed at Constantinople, Antioch was soon left in the shade.

In the fourth century the bishop of the court, whether he resided at Nicomedia, at Constantinople, or at Antioch, was always the centre and the organ of the resistance to the Nicene Creed and of the opposition to St. Athanasius. A sort of permanent Council, composed of members who varied in number, was constantly assembled within reach of the imperial palace. If the sovereign found it useful to bring them into direct communication with the bishops of the West, as he did in 343 for the great Council of Sardica, he would send them off in a body to the place of meeting in a long line of post-carriages and under the protection of an official overseer. If the emperor himself went to sojourn elsewhere, the whole episcopacy moved with him, even far from the East, as was seen at Sirmium, at Milan, and at Arles.

¹ L. Duchesne, *Origines du culte chrétien*, p. 19.

It would be difficult to imagine an episcopal body better organised, easier to guide, and easier to be transported from place to place. But it is evident that this remarkable discipline did not proceed from the same traditions as did the subordination of the African or Egyptian Churches to the Bishops of Carthage and Alexandria. The Bishop of Antioch had sometimes the honour of the first signature in official documents,¹ but it is clear that this precedence did not suppose any actual superiority. The Bishops of Asia, of Thrace, even of those of Pontus and Cappadocia, did not in the least consider themselves subject to his jurisdiction. To give its true name to this episcopal body we ought to call it "the emperor's episcopate."

And yet, if there were nothing else to object to, its anti-traditional formation, administrative rather than ecclesiastical, political rather than religious, would call for our protest! But this unnatural coalition resembles an army determined upon that saddest of all wars, civil war. In 335, the whole Eastern episcopate was invited to meet in Palestine for some great solemnity. They profited by the circumstance to hold a Council at Tyre where, after absolutely illegal proceedings, they deposed St. Athanasius. In 339, they endeavoured to appoint a bishop to the Arians of Alexandria, although Athanasius, thanks to a change

¹ The Council of Tyre was presided over by Eusebius of Cæsarea in Palestine; the letter of 341 began with the name of Dianius, Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia; the Eastern encyclical of Sardica, with that of Stephen of Antioch. At the Council of Seleucia (359), if we may judge by the analyses of Socrates (for the authentications are lost), the presidency seems to have devolved upon the bishops, Acacius of Cæsarea in Palestine and Georges (intended bishop) of Alexandria, Eudoxius of Antioch being present; the signatures to the letter addressed by all to Jovian (363) began with the name of Meletius of Antioch.

of sovereigns, had again taken possession of his See; in 340 they tried to give a bishop to the whole of Alexandria in place of Athanasius. Invited in 341 by Pope Julius, to whom they themselves had referred that affair, to let it be debated in a Council, they answered, by an arrogant letter, declaring that Athanasius had already been deposed at Tyre, and that judgments pronounced in the East ought not to be annulled in the West. In 343, after renouncing that claim, the bishops left in a body for Sardica. Stopping short at the first difficulty they turned their backs on the legitimate Council, and set out again for Antioch, after having promulgated a spiteful encyclical by which they purported to depose Julius, Athanasius, and Osius, all leaders of orthodoxy. During the following years, even when the emperor of the West sought with the greatest zeal to repress the schism, they persisted in refusing to accept the Nicene Creed, as well as all reconciliation with Athanasius. As soon as the Emperor Constantius had become sovereign of the whole empire, they transported their operations into the West, misled or persecuted the minor prelates of Italy and Gaul, deposed or exiled them, until all resistance was crushed; then, disputing among themselves, they hesitated for a time as to which course to adopt, finally choosing the one which wounded the Christian conscience the most deeply. In 359, that episcopal body, in a mock Œcumenical Council, held without the participation of the Pope, sanctioned the radical abandonment of the tradition and creed of the Council of Nice. After the brief reigns of Julian and Jovian, which caused a halt, this schism resumed its course, but its official influence and the abuse so often made of it affected the East alone, until the moment when, meeting with

resistance in the reaction of orthodoxy, and held in awe by an emperor who was devoted to the faith of Nice, it yielded of necessity to the course of events.

The *dogmatic* crisis ended about 381, and the orthodox members of the Eastern episcopacy gained the upper hand; the others (with the exception of a few fanatics, who allowed themselves to be deposed and persecuted) followed the imperial court. As to the *ecclesiastical* crisis, it continued; the antecedent movement had succeeded too well to be abandoned, and was maintained. From the lower Danube to the Syrian desert, the episcopate continued to form a body of which the emperor was morally the head. Constantinople, founded half a century previously, had been endowed with exceptional privileges; they considered it not only as a great city that had been created on the shores of the Bosphorus, but as a new ecclesiastical Rome. After the death of Constantine, there had almost always been two empires, one in the West the other in the East. The new Eastern Rome took the place of Antioch, both as the capital and as the metropolitan See. In 381, the Council claimed for its bishops the same honours as for the bishop of ancient Rome.¹

If this Council favoured a return to orthodoxy, it is evident that it showed much less solicitude for the maintenance of ecclesiastical unity. It can-

¹ This Council was at first little spoken of. There remain but four of its canons in the canonical collections. Most of the eye-witnesses do not mention it; thus St. Jerome, St. Amphilochius of Iconium, St. Gregory of Nyssa (except in his funeral oration of Meletius pronounced on the spot). St. Gregory of Nazianzen, after having presided over it, made it the subject of a very cutting satire (*Carmen de vita sua*, v. 1506, *et seq.*). The historians of the following century hardly pay any attention to it either.

not be denied that this assembly, whilst returning to the true faith, still remained in hostility towards the two great Churches of Rome and Alexandria. Personal questions kept up, if not a schism properly so called, at least certain difficulties of intercourse, which had no longer any pretext as to doctrine. The most elevated mind in that assembly, the illustrious St. Gregory of Nazianzen, perfectly understood the situation and its dangers. He made no mistake as to the spirit which animated the greater number of his colleagues, nor as to their servility towards the civil powers, their low moral value, and the untrustworthiness of their faith. With what animation he describes the insolence of its younger members, and the absurd sayings of the elder ones, proud of having put forth the famous argument of climate: "It was not in the West, but in the East that the Saviour was born." "It was also in the East that He was put to death," answered the witty bishop. At length, feeling disgusted with the whole assembly, he went away, leaving to others the presidency of the Council and the bishopric of Constantinople.

When he was gone, affairs took exactly the turn he had wished to avoid. The local schism that it would have been so easy, just then, to overrule, was maintained at Antioch, and the attitude assumed towards Rome and Alexandria became almost as haughty as in the time of the Emperor Constantius. Convoked by Pope Damasus to a real Œcumenical Council, which, being assembled at Rome, might have settled amicably all the questions in debate, and have obtained real peace for the whole Church, the Eastern episcopacy replied by a refusal full of irony, boasting of all it had done and suffered for the faith, notifying its decisions concerning the Sees that

were contested, and insinuating that the choice of bishops was the business of their fellow-suffragans.¹

The object of their irony was the attitude of the West, and in particular that of Damasus himself, during the reign of Valens. It must be acknowledged that, on this point, Damasus had given some adhesion to it. The orthodox reaction of which I have spoken, headed by Basil of Cæsarea, Meletius of Antioch, and Eusebius of Samos, had not been supported by the Pope as fully as those illustrious bishops would have wished. The Church of Rome patronised in the East certain persons that it would have been better to have left alone. From the time of Pope Julius the Church of Rome incurred the disapproval of the East by rehabilitating Marcellus of Ancyra, whose heretical teaching differed only slightly from the ancient Sabellianism. Under Pope Liberius, a whole body of semi-Arians went to Rome to get themselves approved of by him. It is true that, in both cases, professions of faith were required, which had not, however, the necessary precision to serve as a guarantee. At Antioch a small party was kept up in opposition to that venerable Church, and was provided with a bishop by Lucifer, the fanatical Bishop of Cagliari, in contravention of canon law and of all the rules of prudence. At Laodicea there was a similar situation, in opposition to Bishop Pelagius, who was recognised by the Eastern episcopacy, and support was given to Apollinarius, who though then doubtless a great theological celebrity, was destined soon to give his name to a new heresy.

¹ How many deviations from this principle had they not authorised since Eusebius of Nicomedia had procured the deposition of the Bishops of Antioch and Alexandria! Was it their fellow-suffragans who had installed Auxentius at Milan, Felix at Rome, Germinius at Sirmium, and many others?

Paulinus of Antioch was also a suspected person; he was said to be a Marcellian or a Sabellian, probably because he would not admit of the three *hypostases*.

In all those questions Pope Damasus followed the advice of Peter, Bishop of Alexandria, who, as an exile, had been obliged to take refuge in Rome, and who naturally represented the affairs of the East as they were regarded in Alexandria. This was not the most desirable point of view. The conflicts in the time of St. Athanasius had left bitter recollections in Alexandria. People wished to support the very few friends they had found in the East during that painful crisis, and were little disposed to sacrifice them to the adherents of that new orthodoxy, among whom, no doubt, might be found some honourable persons, such as Basil of Cæsarea, but also many who were to be mistrusted. They were often bitterly spoken of, and treated as though they were still Arians. Meletius, Eusebius of Samos, and even Basil himself, were thus stigmatised at Alexandria, and even at Rome, by those around the Pope. This intimate friendship with Alexandria was not without its drawbacks for the Holy See, for it tended to prolong the conflict beyond all reasonable limits. But how could that friendship be abandoned, existing as it had done, in spite of so many trials, since the time of Novatian until that of Constantius and Valens. Besides, excepting Alexandria, there was no other source of information. For the preceding two or three generations communication between the Church of Rome and the Greeks of the East was no longer what it had been. Pilgrimages to the Holy Land, most attractive since the time of Constantine, kept up, it is

true, a certain intercourse. Many illustrious visitors went, even from Rome, to Palestine. But these journeys to and fro, besides being now less frequent, were not a medium for serious ecclesiastical communication. Indeed, a still greater number of persons might have gone from East to West or from West to East, leaving both regions just as firmly closed as ever one towards another. The difference of language had raised between them a barrier over which it was difficult to pass. At first, the Roman Church spoke Greek; among the books written by Christians in Rome, the most ancient and the most important were written in Greek: as the *Epistle of St. Clement*, the *Pastor of Hermas*, the anti-Montanist *Dialogue of Caius*, and all the literature of Hippolytus. Latin was not used until quite the end of the second century, after the canon of Muratori and the homilies attributed to St. Victor, if in reality they were his. The correspondence with the Churches speaking Greek was carried on in that language; the epitaphs of the Popes, until the end of the third century, were drawn up in Greek.¹ In the fourth century, and later on, it was quite different; the Latin tongue alone prevailed in epigraphs, literature, and liturgy, as well as in epistolary correspondence.²

It is well known that, on their side, the Greeks have never shown any inclination to speak Latin.

¹ The only exception is that of Pope Cornelius, which, however, does not belong to his first tomb, but to a tomb whither the body of that Pope was transferred we know not how many years after his death.

² The letter of Pope Julius (341) to the Orientals, which still exists, and which seems really authentic, is in Greek; but the Pope was just then surrounded by Greek bishops, and, besides, the style of the letter and certain details of importance make it likely that St. Athanasius had a hand in it.

Whether sacred or profane, Latin literature remains practically closed for them. They never cared to bestow upon the Latin tongue more consideration than they would now bestow upon Bulgarian writings. Even when the imperial court was held in their midst, it did not succeed in teaching them Latin, which rather became Hellenised. Latin was used in the law-courts; St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, in order to follow the lessons given in the schools of Berytus, was obliged to learn "the very difficult language of the Romans." But, from the time of Justinian, the translation of the laws was begun, and soon they were published in Greek. A Greek who spoke Latin was seldom to be met with. Photius, who knew so many other things, did not know Latin. Except at the imperial chancery, it was a difficult matter to translate a document written in Latin. Peter, Patriarch of Antioch, in the eleventh century, on receiving a letter from Pope Leo IX., was obliged to send it to Constantinople to know what it contained. It is certain that in Rome, ignorance of Greek never went so far as this. Persons capable of translating it were never at any time wanting. Since the establishment of the Byzantine rule, in the middle of the sixth century, there was always to be found in Rome a pretty considerable Greek colony, which, by renewal in some way or other, was perpetuated all through the Middle Ages, and existed at least in certain monastic communities. During the seventh and eighth centuries there were several Popes belonging to families of Greek origin; but beyond those particular cases, the higher Roman clergy only knew Latin, and took little trouble to acquaint themselves with Greek. Pope Vigilius dwelt eight

or nine years at Constantinople without having learnt Greek ; we may say as much of his illustrious successor, St. Gregory the Great, who also passed several years in the Byzantine capital as nuncio, or apocrisiary.

The apocrisiary, or manager of the nunciature, which, after the time of Justinian, the Pope maintained at Constantinople, besides having only existed there for a century or a century and a half, was himself but an imperfect medium of communication. That functionary had to do with the emperor and not with the Patriarch. The latter often gave him more annoyance than help. It happened most frequently that he neither understood nor spoke the language of the country, and consequently could receive but very indifferent information. Sometimes, when great Councils were held at Constantinople, legates arrived from Rome ; but their ignorance of the language left them at the mercy of official interpreters, who, under the influence of the Patriarch, often procured unpleasant deceptions for them. This is a self-evident fact ; but what is of great importance in the question of which we are now treating is this :—in order to maintain concord, or to recover it, people must necessarily understand each other ; how can they understand each other if they cannot speak to one another ?

But to return to Pope Damasus and to his time. Damasus, like his illustrious colleague, St. Ambrose, was far from being well acquainted with the religious affairs of Syria and Asia Minor ; and thus, influenced unconsciously by some past grievances of the Alexandrians, he was too much inclined to favour certain little cabals, while he did not appreciate the true worth of the great bishops, to whom after all was

due the movement which brought the East back to the faith professed at the Council of Nice. St. Basil tried more than once to enlighten him, and to make him take a part in that salutary reaction, but the Saint only met with a discouraging coolness, of which he justly complains in his letters. Meletius, Eusebius of Samosata, and many others had reason to be discontented also. It is not surprising if five or six years later, the Eastern episcopate remembered them, and that this bitter remembrance should manifest itself, as we have seen, in 381 and 382.¹

After a time matters took a turn for the better. Towards the end of the fourth century, the great Churches of Antioch and Constantinople resumed their customary intercourse with Rome. The *Little Church* of Antioch, abandoned by Rome, was soon absorbed in the great one, and of all the quarrels of the fourth century nothing would have remained but the remembrance thereof, had they not given rise to what is now known as the Greek Church.

That Church, as we have seen, was the consequence of two historical circumstances, viz., the opposition to the Council of Nice, and the grouping of the bishops around the emperor in order to uphold that opposition. Even when the Council of Nice was accepted, this grouping did not cease to exist. It survived its cause; it has been perpetuated until our own days.

¹ Among the lamentable mistakes then made, one of the most serious was to prevent St. Gregory of Nazianzen from remaining in the See of Constantinople. It was putting aside a man of great moral and intellectual worth, and of a most conciliatory character, and to replace him by an absolute simpleton.

II

The bishops of the Council of 381, successors of those who had founded the imperial Church, were determined to make Constantinople the centre of that Church. Without saying so expressly, they decreed that "the Bishop of Constantinople should be honoured next to the Bishop of Rome, Constantinople being new Rome." Another canon regulated that the Bishops of Alexandria and Antioch were not to interfere with the Churches situated beyond their own jurisdiction, *i.e.* the dioceses of Egypt and of the East; that, moreover, the Bishops of Pontus, of Asia, and of Thrace were to settle their affairs with each other, and between themselves. This measure was directed principally against the Bishops of Alexandria, who, trusting to their own importance, to their firm allegiance to Rome, and to the prestige due to their success in the question of the orthodoxy of Nice, began to act as if they were heads of the Eastern Church. St. Gregory of Nazianzen had been enthroned in the See of Constantinople, and if Nectarius succeeded him, it was in spite of Timothy, the Patriarch of Alexandria, who wished to impose another candidate.

He was beaten on that occasion. But the struggle continued between the two Primates of Constantinople and Alexandria, and the question was to know which of the two would command the new ecclesiastical body of the Eastern Empire. Constantinople had in its favour the letter, and above all the spirit, of the recent Council, and felt itself upheld by the traditions of the official imperial Church, whose presidents had been Eusebius of Nicomedia, Stephen and Leontius of Antioch, Acacius of Cæsarea,

Eudoxius of Constantinople, and, lastly, the blessed Meletius. It succeeded to these presidents much more than to the former titulars of the See of Byzantium or Constantinople. Placed as it was in the immediate neighbourhood of the court, its primate seemed a useful and almost necessary intermediary between the provincial episcopacy and the superior powers. On this account, its influence could not fail to assume enormous proportions. Its attributes had not been clearly defined by the Council; it was free to extend them. As far as Antioch at least, who could resist it?

On the other hand, the Bishop of Alexandria, besides the orthodox tradition which he represented, had the advantage of a well-defined authority consecrated by long usage. The hundred bishops of his jurisdiction were under his sway; none of them would have dared to act in opposition to him, nor to speak until they had taken his advice. He was supported also by the monks who were just then becoming a popular element of strength. They had stood by him in his campaign in favour of Athanasius, who had, himself, never ceased to protect them. This alliance between the monks and the Bishop of Alexandria (already styled the episcopal Pharaoh) was complete and indissoluble. At a sign from him the deserts of Nitria, of Fayoum, and of Upper Egypt would have sent forth troops of monks fanatically devoted to his cause. From the fact of his high ecclesiastical position he was regarded as the first personage in Egypt. The imperial prefect and the military commander had to reckon with him. Woe to them! woe to the public peace! if they ventured to oppose him! His prestige was not even wanting in a certain literary superiority. The school

of Origen still subsisted, its leaders were talked of in the solitary dwellings of Nitria, learned monks meditated upon the books of their former master. It was the Bishop of Alexandria who regulated the Paschal computation, his decisions were law throughout the Eastern Empire; even at Rome, where there was less skilfulness in those calculations, his were almost always accepted. Lastly, if any theological dispute arose, the great prelate showed that he was also a doctor who did not shrink from polemics. This was the case with Athanasius, with Theophilus, and Cyril. The court, it is true, was far away; but there were many Egyptians at Constantinople. Every spring the service of the Annona sent thither an immense fleet, whose crews escorted the Pontiff of Alexandria when he landed at the Golden Horn. He had his nunciature, entrusted to men of his own choice, and well supplied with funds; much could be obtained at the court by money, and money was not wanting to this Egyptian prince.

Conflict was inevitable between those two powers. Alexandria at first prevailed. At each vacancy of the See of Constantinople the Egyptian Patriarch put forward his own candidate. If this candidate was unsuccessful, or if the one elected was not pleasing to Alexandria, the slightest pretext brought about a tragedy. Three times in less than half a century the Greek Church was witness of the deposition of a bishop of Constantinople by a bishop of Alexandria: Chrysostom in 403; Nestorius in 431; Flavian in 449. And they were not simply depositions in theory; those three prelates were really deprived of their Sees and banished. Indeed, all the three died in consequence of their afflictions. I know that, in point of law, differences are to be

made in the three cases: that the deposition of Nestorius was ratified by the papal legates at the Council of Ephesus; that Chrysostom and Flavian, who were innocent victims, were defended and reinstated by the Holy See, to whose support they had appealed. But, in the three cases, the Eastern episcopacy accepted, or submitted to, the sentence of Alexandria; by its silence at least, it sided with the victorious Pharaoh.

What might have happened if that series of successes had continued? Would the "Pope of Alexandria" (for they gave him that title) have been recognised as head of the Greek episcopacy? Would that situation have been secured to him by some official decree? In reality his third triumph was his last. At the Council of Chalcedon (451) Dioscorus, Patriarch of Alexandria, was seen at the bar of the accused, while the Roman legate was heard to pronounce this solemn sentence: "The most holy and blessed Archbishop of great and ancient Rome, Leo, by us and by the Holy Synod here present, in union with the Blessed Apostle Peter, who is the corner-stone of the Catholic Church, has deprived Dioscorus of episcopal dignity and has forbidden him all sacerdotal functions."

Dioscorus, indeed, was cast down, but the blow reached still farther. Egypt did not accept the deposition of her Patriarch; she remained faithful to him and even gave him successors, who never ceased to protest against Pope Leo the Great and the Council of Chalcedon. All the efforts made to bring her back failed; from the middle of the fifth century she may be considered as lost to the unity of the Catholic Church. Following her example, Eastern Syria was transformed into a

schismatical Church. Both in Syria and in Egypt the orthodox Christians formed but a small minority. In the seventh century the conquests of Islamism suppressed the three official patriarchates of Alexandria, Jerusalem, and Antioch. When they reappeared a hundred years later, a considerable part of the native Christians had abandoned Jesus Christ for Mahomet.

The Christian communities of Egypt and Syria, being separated from the others by heresy, schism, and the religious and political success of Islamism, could no longer pretend to exercise over them any direction or influence whatsoever. Their disappearance turned to the profit of the patriarchate of Constantinople, the only one that really survived. Its organisation had been regulated at the Council of Chalcedon, in the 28th canon. In vain did Pope Leo protest; the nominal concessions granted to him in no way stopped the progress of an ecclesiastical centralisation around the capital and its archbishop.

The Pope had his reasons for protesting. The new organisation infringed upon the rights of others, and threatened, more or less directly, the justly acquired positions of the ancient Churches of Antioch and Alexandria; it rested, moreover, upon a wholly inadmissible statement, which runs thus: "The Fathers justly decreed special honours to the See of ancient Rome, because Rome had the rank of a capital; thus we, &c. . . ." This "decree" of the Fathers is yet undiscovered. Unless it could be admitted that the assembly of Chalcedon refers to some secret general Council, all traces of which have disappeared, and of which Eusebius and the other contemporaries of the Council of Nice would not

have had the least knowledge, I do not see what they could mean. Besides, any such general Council must have been previous to the third or even to the second century, for in those times we see the Roman Church invested, not only with honorary prerogatives, but with universal and uncontested authority. Going back thus, we easily come to the apostolic age. But that is not what the Bishops of Chalcedon meant; the "Fathers" of whom they speak are not apostles but bishops; they mean to bring down to the level of their own authority, the authority from which the supremacy of the Roman Church is derived. In this they erred: the Church of Rome owes nothing to Councils; her authority comes from a higher source. The emperors could have founded a new Rome; to create a second Roman Church is far above all episcopal powers.

III

Thus indisputably provided with a centre and a head, the Byzantine Church continued to work out its destiny. In itself, this autonomy of the Greeks had nothing that was incompatible with ecclesiastical unity. The African autonomy, organised long before, found means of living in peace with the Holy See. To come to an understanding was the only thing now requisite, and it must not be imagined that this was never accomplished. Excepting during the intervals of schism already indicated, there had been periods of absolute concord. When studying the divers manifestations of Byzantine opinion, it is easy to recognise certain sentiments in favour of peace.

Firstly, the sentiment of the unity of the Church.

This sentiment was shown by the introduction,¹ almost everywhere, after the end of the fifth century, of the Constantinopolitan Nicene Creed into the liturgy of the Mass. This sentiment, not yet stifled by subtle distinctions, prevented the populace from feeling and from being resigned to the guilt of schism. Schism appeared as an irregular, and an inferior state; there was always a sort of general remorse of conscience in opposition to it. No trouble was spared to bring back the Monophysites to unity of faith. The *Henotikon* of Zeno, the conferences procured by Justinian, the rigorous measures against the dissident bishops, the condemnation of the "Three Chapters" and of Monothelism, were so many different proceedings tried, one after another, with a rare perseverance, for so laudable an object. Nothing, however, was gained. It would have been easier to come to an understanding with the Pope. There was but one attitude to abandon; yet, owing to frequent changes on the part of individuals, it was easy for either of them to throw the responsibilities upon their predecessors. Lastly, the emperor was there to procure an understanding, to calm susceptibilities, to favour, and, if need be, to impose, the re-establishment of peace.

There was, moreover, then a much clearer apprehension of the supremacy of the Pope than in our own days. That supremacy was uncontested. In all documents where episcopal Sees are enumerated in their order of precedence, the list always begins with

¹ That introduction was made by the heretical Patriarchs, Peter the Fuller of Antioch and Timothy of Constantinople. In prescribing the reading of that formula, they meant to protest against the one drawn up at the Council of Chalcedon. We see that the Church of Rome had her reasons for hesitating so long before inserting the *Credo* in the liturgy of the Holy Eucharist.

that of Rome. The Patriarch of Constantinople, whatever rights he claimed over the Greek Church, and however tenaciously he held to the title “œcumenical,” never regarded himself as superior, or even equal to the Pope. Even as late as the twelfth century, one hundred years after Cerularius, the canonists, Zonaras and Balsamon, recognised expressly this papal superiority. They even entered a protest against such writers as put forth another interpretation of the third canon of Constantinople, which states that the Bishop of Constantinople has honours *after* the Bishop of Rome, and who falsely inferred therefrom that Constantinople had received first honours, while Rome already possessed them.¹ Zonaras and Balsamon do not fall into this error; they rightly see in the text not posteriority, but absolute inferiority.

The Roman supremacy was not looked upon as a mere matter of form. Frequently Greek writers and

¹ There were even found persons to advance the pretension that the See of Constantinople was of greater antiquity than the See of Rome. In order to lend credence to that absurd pretension, a forgery, which dates, perhaps, from the close of the sixth century, and which is certainly anterior to the ninth century, was produced, a pretended list of bishops carried up from Metrophanes, the first known Bishop of Byzantium, to Stachys, disciple of St. Andrew, and even on to that Apostle himself. That forgery, obscure in its origin, ended by gaining credence to a certain extent. At the opening of the ninth century, Theophanes treated it as of no account, whilst his contemporary, the Patriarch Nicephorus, upheld it. One cannot but regret to see a writer of the value of Manuel Gédéon accepting it in his work (*Πατριαρχικὸν πίνακες*, published at Constantinople, 1886). It is merely the equivalent of those legendary lists of bishops by which certain of the occidental Churches seek to make themselves direct descendants of the disciples of St. Peter. One such, published two hundred years ago, the French clergy unanimously rejected, whereas now such documents are credited, even by some bishops. Evidence of antiquity does not transform an apocryphal document into an authentic one, either in Constantinople or nearer home; but when education is at its lowest ebb, victims of such false evidence are likely to increase both in number and importance.

Councils acknowledged it as a right and a duty of the Pope to exercise general control over the religious concerns of their country, and claimed his support against the oppression of those in power, and addressed him by the most significant and high-sounding titles. Texts of this nature having often been compiled in theological and controversial writings, a few observations thereon will suffice.

In matters of dogma and of ecclesiastical intercourse, the participation, or at least the consent, of the Pope was deemed necessary for the definite solution of any question, as the prolonged schisms already enumerated conclusively prove. An endeavour was made, in 340, to obtain the papal sanction for an usurping bishop in Alexandria. For the questions of Monothelism, and of the prohibition of images, the Pope's advice was asked, even though not acted upon by those who had recourse, in spite of his decision, to the support of the government. When there was a rupture, it was not the Greek Church which declared it; she had only to yield to it. It was always from Rome that the *Non licet* emanated, and, whilst the Greek Church managed to withstand Rome every now and then, it had always to submit in the end.

Supreme in doctrinal authority, the Holy See was also the highest court of appeal beyond which there was no imaginable resource. Many ecclesiastical sentences pronounced by the Eastern Church in council, or by its most renowned leaders, have been reversed by Rome, as, for instance, the deposition of St. Athanasius in the Council of Tyre. The judges, it is true, for a time, denied the Pope's competency which they had previously implicitly acknowledged when asking him to settle the question. No later than 346, by accepting the re-integration of St.

Athanasius in his See of Alexandria, by waiving the grievances urged against him at the Council of Tyre, they implicitly recognised the reversal of their sentence. Their successors, on their return to orthodoxy, acted likewise in the most formal manner. Another instance is the deposition of St. John Chrysostom, which was reversed by Pope Innocent. In this case, as in the former one, the Greek bishops at first resisted; but a very few years later they had to acknowledge themselves in the wrong. Chrysostom had appealed to the Pope. In 449 three bishops: Flavian of Constantinople, Eusebius of Doryleum, Theodoret of Cyr, who had been condemned by the Œcumenical Council of Ephesus, appealed formally to Pope Leo against the decision of the Council.¹

Several Greek Patriarchs were deposed by the Pope: among others, Dioscorus of Alexandria, in 450; Acacius and Anthimius of Constantinople, in 484 and in 536. Acacius, upheld by the emperor, made light of the sentence of Pope Felix III.; but the two other sentences were duly executed. It was in the very town of Constantinople that Pope Agapitus pronounced the deposition of Anthimius, and immediately installed Menas as his successor.

It was not to be expected that appeals to Rome would be of frequent occurrence in the Eastern Church.² The Greek Patriarchs seldom found it necessary to appeal to the supreme tribunal of Christendom. As to the minor prelates, priests, or other clerics, local jurisdiction was not wanting

¹ The letters of Theodoret have been long known, those of Flavian and Eusebius were published but recently, firstly by M. Aurelli and afterwards by M. Mommsen, *Neues Archiv*, lxi. (1886) p. 362.

² I do not, of course, allude here to the provinces of Illyricum, which were comprised in the Roman patriarchate.

for the settlement of their lawsuits. Nevertheless, were we in possession of more than the barest remnants of the archives of the Holy See, these would very likely furnish some interesting facts on this subject. During the pontificate of St. Gregory, two priests of the patriarchate of Constantinople, John of Chalcedon and Athanasius of Isaura, condemned as heretics by the Patriarch's judges, appealed to Rome and obtained a sentence of absolution.¹ I printed, some years ago,² a hitherto unpublished fragment from the great Council of 394, held near Chalcedon, under the presidency of Nectarius of Constantinople and Theophilus of Alexandria. That assembly had to concern itself about a conflict between two bishops, Badagios and Agapios, who opposed one another, each laying claim to the metropolitan See of Bostra. This fact was patent, but what was less generally known was that this matter had been laid before the Council by Pope Siricius, to whom it had been first referred by both disputants.³ It was about the right course to pursue according to the fifth canon of the Council of Sardica. An appeal against a sentence in Council can be addressed to Rome; the Pope decides whether or not the appeal is well founded. Should he deem it right to order a new trial, this would take place, not in Rome, but before a conciliary tribunal in the neighbourhood of the first judges.

The Council of Sardica had only been recog-

¹ Jaffé, 1257, 1357, 1393--1396.

² *Annales de philosophie chrét.*, année 1885, p. 281.

³ *Pro causa quorundam Badagii et Agapii de episcopatu Bostrinæ ecclesiæ quæ est metropolis Arabiæ sic diuturno tempore certantium ut etiam Romanam pergerent et illinc ad sanctum Theophilum cum litteris beati papæ Siricii mitterentur.*

nised by a fraction of the Greek Church, viz., the Egyptian episcopate. The decisions of that Council found place eventually in the collections of Byzantine canons; but one must not conclude that all conciliary laws, inserted in ecclesiastical collections as such, held force of law for the countries where they obtained currency. It would be more prudent to look upon such facts as the exception rather than the rule. In the Middle Ages, when there was question of the reunion of the Churches, the right of appeal to the Pope was what principally alarmed the Byzantine clergy. It is not my business to determine what would be the conditions laid down were fresh negotiations entered into; but it seems to me that, were the right of appeal limited to very rare, exceptional cases, matters would be placed very much as they were previously to the great upheavals of the ninth and eleventh centuries.

Besides the sentiment of Christian unity and of the supremacy of the Church, the veneration in which Rome was held in the East, as it was throughout Christendom, undoubtedly made for peace. Pilgrimages from the East to Rome, though less frequent than those to the Holy Land, were, however, often undertaken. From the middle of the sixth century, a Greek colony was formed around the Palatinate, composed of resident families, brought thither either in the interests of commerce or in some administrative capacity, and the quarters they occupied seemed, so to speak, a fragment of Constantinople transported to the banks of the Tiber. Byzantine saints were in special honour among them: to wit, St. Anastasia, St. George, St. Theodore, Saints Sergius and Bacchus, St. Hadrian, St. Boniface, and St. Sabas. The military confrater-

nity of the district (*Schola Græcorum*) had its chapel placed under the title of *St. Mary in Cosmidin*. The Greek liturgy was partly used in most of the churches. Even in public ceremonies, where the Roman Church was convoked, and where the Pope officiated, the Greek liturgy was employed side by side with the Latin.

Those Greeks of Rome formed a most useful link between Italy and the Byzantine world; keeping up a connection which greatly facilitated travelling from the East, and rendered pilgrimages thence to Rome not only frequent but easy to undertake.

Further and even greater facilities of communication were provided by the Greek monasteries so numerous in Rome. The twofold attraction of the Roman sanctuaries and of the Byzantine colony established there, the invasion of the Eastern provinces by Mussulman Arabs, the persecutions carried on in the seventh century by monothelite princes, and in the eighth and ninth centuries by iconoclastic governments—all these causes brought about a series of migrations from the East, and of settlements in Rome, of large numbers of Greek monks, men of influence and learning, who had to be taken into serious consideration and who were able at certain moments to be of great use to the Roman cause.

Thus it was that Rome and Constantinople lived, so to say, side by side in perfect understanding and mutual goodwill, giving evidence of the possibility of a complete reconciliation, even as in walking one proves the possibility of movement. The monks of St. Erasmus and of St. Sabas equalled their fellows of Antioch or of Bithynia in the length of their beards; celebrated the same offices, the same liturgy, in the tongue and according to the ritual of their

own country; they were well aware of the Western rite for administering baptism, and of the Roman doctrine concerning the Holy Ghost and Purgatory. As no position in Rome was too high for them to attain to, it was one of their number, Pope Zachary, who translated for them the *Dialogues of St. Gregory*, a book which treats largely of the doctrine of Purgatory. Nothing that they saw or heard of Roman doctrine or practice gave rise, on their part to any suggestion of heresy, or to any wish to detach themselves from communion with Rome.

At Constantinople, on the contrary, there were no Latin communities. There is no trace of any corporate organisation, or of any churches specially set apart either for Italians, Africans, or any other Western people sojourning in the Byzantine capital. The inner chapel of the Placidian Palace, which was the official residence of the papal nuncio, was the only spot in Constantinople where the Roman liturgy was celebrated.

IV

I have briefly enumerated such institutions and such tendencies as might have helped towards reunion. Small things in themselves they were, no doubt; still such as, in a spirit of goodwill, might have led to perfect concord. The terrible upheaval of the fourth century might have been classed as a mere historical event, and have given way to a state of things more in accordance with original traditions. Unfortunately, goodwill was the one thing wanting. The Bishops of Constantinople, far from being satisfied with the preponderant and anti-traditional situation, which they held from the

assemblies of 381 and of 451, nourished but one ambition—that of becoming the absolute heads of the Church. Infatuated by the magnitude of their city, by their preponderance in the Councils of the emperor, incapable of realising the importance of aught outside the Greek sphere of influence, they came to look upon themselves as the centre of Christendom. From the close of the sixth century, they adopted, despite all protests from Rome, the fantastical title of “Œcumenical Patriarch.”

It is clear that, in their pretensions, they did not go so far as to place themselves above the Pope; in fact, they even constantly declared their unwillingness to lessen the authority of other Greek Patriarchs. But wherefore, then, did they adopt this title of “Œcumenical,” *i.e.* universal? Either it gives one to understand that the Patriarch of Constantinople is the Universal Patriarch, and in that case, what remains to the others? or it is an absolutely meaningless title, equally pompous and misleading, and presents but a sorry picture of the modesty of those who invented it. Formerly, the Patriarch refrained from travelling on horseback, humbly contenting himself with riding on an ass. How preferable it would have been to have travelled in a coach-and-four rather than adopt titles so excessive in regard to himself, and so insulting towards others.

And that was far from all! After having been so frequently guided back from error to orthodoxy by the vigilance of the Church of Rome, the Greek Church presumed to dictate to her on grounds of discipline, as was seen in 692 in the Council in *Trullo*, or *Quini-Sexte*, which assembly undertook the task of introducing uniformity into

divers ecclesiastical customs. In Rome, in Africa, and in Armenia several details of discipline or of liturgy were at variance with those in use at Constantinople. In Africa, on Maundy Thursday, the celebration of the Holy Eucharist followed immediately upon the repast, the idea being to reproduce with greater exactness the historical circumstances of the Last Supper. The Armenians did not mix water in the chalice, neither did they, on the Sundays in Lent, refrain from the use of eggs and cheese; and, again, their priests accepted in church joints of meat brought to them by their parishioners. In Rome the number of deacons was limited to seven, whilst at Constantinople it was unlimited. Mass was celebrated every day throughout Lent; but at Constantinople only on Saturdays and Sundays. On the other hand, the Occidental Church fasted on Saturdays in Lent, not so the Oriental; and at Easter and Pentecost offered at the altar milk and honey for the newly baptized, a custom also unknown to the Byzantines. Greek priests and deacons could live in the married state, provided marriage had been contracted prior to ordination; a licence not extended to the Latin clergy.¹

The Council condemned equally as abuses all purely local particularities. Any differences from the proceedings in vogue at Constantinople were declared "contrary to tradition"; the Byzantine rule was to be enforced, and that under the severest penalties. Excommunication was pronounced against such of the Roman laity as fasted on the Saturdays in Lent, and dismissal was the

¹ *African Customs incriminated by the Council*, canon 29; *Armenian*, c. 32, 33, 56, 99; *Roman*, c. 13, 16, 30, 52, 55, 56, 57.

penalty for any clerk guilty of a similar practice. Deposition was also the penalty incurred by any priest or deacon refusing to cohabit with his wife, as well as by those who denied the lawfulness of such cohabitation. It is clear from what we have seen that even the Pope—indeed, I may say, especially the Pope—was attainted by such threats of deposition. Refusal to accept the Byzantine ruling in place of the ancient customs of the Roman Church, would warrant the Pope's being dispossessed of his See and of his sacerdotal dignity.

It is a sad sign of those times that Roman legates could be found capable of signing such decrees, which, more lamentable again to relate, did not meet, even in Rome itself, with such clear and universal reprobation as they deserved. One must allow that Justinian II. was a tyrant, whose will it was hard to oppose, and who confirmed the decisions of his Council by deeds of violence. Under the Popes Sergius (687–701), John VII. (705–707), and Constantine (708–715) imperial commissaries visited Rome, carried off the papal councillors, and tried to rule the Pope by terrorism. But neither measures of violence, nor measures of clemency, which sometimes intervened, obtained any definite result. Pope John VII. has been accused of weakness; never, however, did he append his signature. The conflict ended by the voyage of Pope Constantine to the imperial court, where, though he uttered no condemnation against the Council, he at any rate succeeded in making the emperor accept his motives for remaining passive. The death of Justinian II. freed Rome from those obsessions; but the disputable canons remained in Byzantine law, a lasting witness of an undertaking, which failed

certainly, but was significantly directed against the independence and dignity of the Roman Church. Had Rome remained part of the Byzantine Empire, it is more than probable that such attempts would have been followed by similar ones. But, from the coming to the Lombard throne of King Liutprand, the Byzantine rule in Italy became more and more precarious. An attempt at religious reform, the abolition of the veneration of images, inaugurated in 726 by the Emperor Leo the Isaurian, fell through completely in Italy in face of the opposition raised by Popes Gregory II. and Gregory III. It became at last evident to the Byzantine Government that it now lacked power enough to oppress consciences in those distant countries. After some further attempts, it made up its mind to molest the Pope no further, and even made use of his influence to negotiate with the much-dreaded Lombards.

The quarrel about images, which raged so violently in the East (726-842), brought about fresh schisms between Rome and the patriarchate. The Greek monks gave active support to the use of images, encouraged in this by public opinion and by the approval of persons of piety; but the episcopate and the army were on the government side. The condition of things was much the same as in the fourth century, in the time of St. Athanasius and the Arians. Rome took little or no part in the quarrel, feeling itself safe from any territorial aggression on the part of the Greek Empire. It contented itself with giving refuge to the persecuted monks, and with defending its traditions with the help of Councils.

Precisely at the time of this religious crisis, an event occurred of considerable importance in the

political sphere, which helped greatly to complicate, and even to embitter, relations between the Latin Church and the Greek. This event was the passing of Rome from under the dependence of the Byzantine Empire to the protectorate of the Franks. No matter what concourse of circumstances contributed to bring about this change of influence, it will be readily understood that such a change could not but be highly displeasing to the Byzantine court, and absolutely antagonistic to Greek opinions as a whole! Rome detached from the Roman Empire, Rome under the yoke of barbarians, Rome no longer Roman! It was thus that the change presented itself to the Byzantine mind, and a monstrous thing it appeared; a sufficient plea indeed for detaching from the Roman patriarchate the ancient Greek provinces of Illyricum, and annexing them to the patriarchate of Constantinople, as also the bishoprics of Sicily and of lower Italy. In a word, wherever the authority of the emperor continued to be recognised, these enactments were enforced.

The above measures, intended merely as provisional during the eighth and ninth centuries, became definitively established about the year 900. The catalogues of the episcopal Sees in the Greek patriarchate give a very clear account of their origin as follows: "These provinces," they explain, "have been annexed to the Synod of Constantinople because the Pope of ancient Rome is in the hands of barbarians; the same has been done, and for a similar motive, by the provinces of Seleucia and of Isauria, now detached from the Eastern patriarchate." Effectively, the Eastern patriarchal see of Antioch had fallen under the power of the Caliph, whilst the province of Isauria remained under that of the

emperor. The Frankish state and the Mussulman state are here placed on a similar footing.

During the severe persecutions which they had to undergo in the defence of images, the Greek monks looked frequently to Rome. Many of them emigrated thither; others, like St. Theodore Studitus, earnestly invoked the support of the Holy See. Very eloquent passages have been drawn from his letters concerning the primacy and the authority of the Pope. They are the continuation of the appeals of St. Basil, of St. Chrysostom, of Flavian, of Eusebius of Doryleum, of Theodoret, of Sophronius, and of many others. History repeats itself. When in want of the Pope's help, when there appears a chance of obtaining something from him, his prerogatives are clearly established, clearly set forth, placed in bold relief, exalted in all the pomp of eloquence. When, on the contrary, his help is not required, all his rights and prerogatives are promptly lost sight of, or ignored.

Proof of this was amply provided towards the close of the ninth century, during the well-known quarrel between Ignatius and Photius. Ignatius, dispossessed of his See by Photius, immediately appealed to Rome. Barely, however, re-installed in his patriarchate by the Holy See, Ignatius at once started an intrigue with the Bulgarians tending to withdraw their newly founded Church from the Roman obedience, and persisting in his rebellious attitude despite the papal protest. An ultimatum, accompanied by threats of deposition, had just been launched against him by the Holy See, when the news of his death reached Rome.¹

¹ Baronius places him in the Roman martyrology; which is certainly displaying great indulgence.

The details of this affair are well known, and modern research has from time to time thrown fresh light on the subject. One may come to the conclusion that Pope Nicholas, badly or unfortunately advised, started, without due consideration, a most serious quarrel, which it would, at the time, have been easy to avert, and in the course of which the Holy See lost, in the East, much of the consideration it had hitherto enjoyed. Nicholas, and several of his successors, employed a very determined tone in treating with Photius. Many of their letters, it is true, failed to reach their destination, and to those that were received by him, Photius replied in an equally imperious tone. Nicholas deposed Photius; Photius deposed Nicholas — neither sentence producing the slightest effect. Twice, it is true, Photius lost his patriarchal See, but each time as a consequence of political changes, and not in virtue of the pontifical decrees. Whilst the Council of 869 ratified his deposition, that of 879 confirmed his re-establishment, the one like the other being presided over by papal legates, neither of whom was disowned at Rome on any important point. By comparing the documents of those two assemblies, it is easily seen that, whereas the sentence of 869 was submitted to with great repugnance by the whole Greek episcopate, that of 879 met with enthusiastic acquiescence. At last, Pope John IX. decided to forgive and forget all these quarrels, and to recognise impartially all the Greek Patriarchs, whether Photians or Ignatians; while Constantinople agreed to recognise all the Popes, whether they had been favourable to Photius or not.

V

Two things survived this useless quarrel: Firstly, the remembrance of a contest maintained, not unsuccessfully, against the Church of Rome, and, secondly, the writings of Photius. In Photian literature appears for the first time in writing the Greek protest against the *Filioque*; there for the second time (repeating the error of the Council in *Trullo*) one notes the head of the Greek Church calling the Latin Church to account for the peculiarities of its customs, and presenting its point of view with the utmost literary and polemical talent. Such books were bound to excite and maintain restlessness and anxiety of opinion concerning Occidentals. They found readers and imitators; indeed all Byzantine controversialists went to them for inspiration. It is clear that, whilst Photius showed defects similar to those of Ulysses, he likewise possessed the redoubtable qualities of his renowned compatriot.

In the matter of Photius, as in that of sacred images, the Holy See leant, in the East, on a more or less important religious party. Siding with Rome were the monks, the supporters of the use of holy pictures; also, the followers of Ignatius, few in number, but very tenacious. Rome triumphed with the first-named, and resigned herself regarding the latter. Both were honourable allies; but, in the tenth century, we again see the Pope mixed up in Byzantine concerns, and this time with far less honourable allies, and condescending to play a part little calculated to raise him in the esteem or consideration of religious persons.

First of all, there was the tetragamy affair. The emperor, Leo VI., had contracted marriage four

times, and it must be admitted that he had excellent motives for so doing. But Greek custom allowing one to contract marriage but twice, a conflict arose between the Sovereign and his clergy, the latter being led on by a man as clever as Photius and almost as cultivated, the Patriarch Nicholas Mysticus. As a last resource, the emperor determined to call together a sort of Œcumenical Council, convoking from the territory under Mussulman rule three representatives of the Eastern Patriarchs. From Rome, Pope Sergius III. sent legates (907), who naturally took precedence over all others in the management of the business in hand, as also all responsibilities concerning it. It was impossible for the papal legates to canonise the Byzantine law in respect of marriage, since the Latin Church knows no such matrimonial restrictions, and Charlemagne had offered, in his own conduct, an illustrious and significant example. The papal legates gave their decision in favour of the Byzantine emperor. Many religious persons, even among those who were hostile to the Patriarch and who eventually helped to substitute another in his stead, looked upon the decision of the papal legates as a grave infringement of Christian morality.

How much greater must have been their painful astonishment when, twenty-six years later, legates came from Rome to Constantinople commissioned to impose upon them a Patriarch only thirteen years old, under the pretext of this child's being the son of the reigning emperor, himself an usurper, Romanus Lecapenus? The protestations raised by the great canonists against so extraordinary an installation have come down to our own time. They disputed the Pope's right of interference in the election of

Patriarchs, stating that his action in this case was without precedent; they allowed that, in cases of disagreement in matters of faith, it was customary to invoke the help of the Pope and of the other Patriarchs, but they argued that the enthroning of the Archbishop of Constantinople had always taken place without such assistance. Sad to say, their objections on the score of legality were not the only ones that could be offered.¹

The two facts given above, whilst they undoubtedly produced at the time a deplorable impression in the Eastern Church, may serve, however, to demonstrate :

1st. That the terms of communion between Rome and Constantinople remained the same as had been established in 900, under the direction of John IX.

2nd. That the authority of the Patriarch was always looked upon as inferior to that of the Pope, whether the latter was supported or not by the Greek Patriarchs. Such had been the Byzantine principles before the time of Photius, and such they continued to be.

3rd. That the harsh writings of Photius concerning discipline, or the *Filioque* were no more remembered in Constantinople.

The situation remained the same for more than a hundred years after, until the time of Michael Cerularius. The most we can say is, that perhaps, from the fact of the conquest of Sicily by the Saracens having caused a fresh inrush of Greek popula-

¹ It is as well to state that Pope John XI., the sender of those legates, was himself very young, and was also, like the little Patriarch Theophylact, the son of an usurper. His mother, Marozia, represented in Rome the existing temporal power, but *not* the legitimate one.

tion into Italy, its consequences may have caused some increase in the Greek patriarchal influence on the ecclesiastical organisations of that country. Already, towards the close of the ninth century, there existed at Reggio and at Santa Severina two metropolitans, suffragans of Constantinople. The tenth century witnessed the further erection of the Sees of Otranto, Tarentum, and Brindisi. The Pope, on his side, opposed to the above foundations the Latin Sees of Capua, Salerno, Beneventum, Bari, Naples, Sorrento, and Amalfi. But this action of the Pope did not entail an open rupture. Though he never ceased, theoretically, to protest against this parcelling out of the country, formerly under his jurisdiction, in practice he resigned himself to it, until the Normans, by the changes they wrought in political divisions of the land, brought back ecclesiastical obedience to its primitive state.

The rupture ought, therefore, by rights to be attributed to Cerularius and his followers. But, from the above, it is easy to conclude that they had but little to do in order to complete a work already so far advanced. The faintest breeze was sufficient to bring down so ripe a crop of fruit.

In point of fact, the Greek schism dates as far back as the fourth century; its real authors were neither Cerularius, nor yet Photius, but Eusebius of Nicomedia and his accomplices, in his opposition to the Council of Nice. It was under the guidance of this party that the autonomy of the Byzantine episcopate was first organised and established. This autonomy revealed itself from the first under two most unfortunate aspects. From the dawn of its history, the Greek Church was at war with Christian tradition concerning the divinity of our Lord Jesus

Christ, and at the same time was on very good terms with imperial despotism. The doctrinal war came to an end, to break out later, alas ! on other points ; but the cringing to imperial despotism continued and ended in that sad alliance known by the name of Cæsaro-papism.

It is quite possible that, even setting aside all religious conflict, even supposing that the whole Greek episcopacy had accepted the Council of Nice, the attraction of the court and of the capital might have caused a grouping of the Eastern Churches around the See of Constantinople, and thus have brought about, more or less rapidly, the formation of a Greek autonomy. The divergence of tongues, combined with the Hellenic contempt of the Latin race, might also have contributed to a like result. The Roman Empire had succeeded in overpowering and even in suppressing the tongues of all the other conquered nations—such as the Syriac, Coptic, Celtic, Iberian, Phœnician, Etruscan, and many others ; but it had never attempted anything in the direction of the Greek language. The result was that Greek ranked side by side with Latin as a second official tongue, and this cause brought about the division of the empire. Nor was it merely a question of tongues. Latins as well as Greeks knew and recognised that all intellectual culture in the West had its origin in Greek antiquity ; hence arose a superiority that, when once the empire was divided, promptly gave to the Greek portion a preponderance over the Latin.

Similar causes produced in the Church similar effects. If we see Photius speaking so disdainfully to Pope Nicholas, and again Cerularius making a jest of the legates of Leo IX., if the Patriarch

Anthimius adopts so haughty an attitude towards Rome, we may take it, up to a certain point, as originating in the fact that Plautus was the pupil of Meander, and Virgil the pupil of Homer. The good old Christians of Phrygia and Achaia, during the days of persecution, were much more occupied with the Gospel and with thoughts of the last judgment than with the literary glories of Athens. The kingdom of Heaven was much more to them than Greek tradition, and so long as Christianity was confined to them, all went well; but, in course of time the cultivated Greeks were likewise converted, and with them the literary infatuation of Hellenism and of its philosophy penetrated into the Church: a philosophy which injured belief, sometimes by direct attacks, at other times by a defence that was even more dangerous from the form it took. Literary infatuation upheld political pride and helped to vitiate the ecclesiastical conscience completely. The servants of God gave themselves up to the pursuit of things not pertaining to the kingdom of God, and, no longer caring to preserve its unity, they sought only honours and dignities.

But all that belongs to the history of the past. There is no longer a Roman Empire, either Latin or Greek; scarcely can we say now that there is a Patriarch at Constantinople: those who bear such a title are mere puppets, mere shadows, appearing and disappearing according to the dictates of some more or less secret committee, itself guided by no religious interest whatever. We of the West now represent all that survives of Hellenism; it is we who have kept up the traditions of Greek scholarship, who, day by day, regain some fragment, artistic or literary, of antique civilisation. It is our laws, our customs,

and our industries that combine to call back to life, little by little, the East of former days, and which, even more than our armies or our diplomacy, offer it the possibility of throwing off the oppression under which it still groans. There is a complete reversal of the former order of things: the sun still rises in the East, but spiritual light comes from the West. *Ex oriente lux, ex occidente lex.*

Why, then, need we cling to all this ecclesiastical archæology? Why allow all these dead bones to weigh down our living Christianity? Our ancestors quarrelled—some were right, some were wrong; they were perhaps not always the same. Why not let them slumber in the pages of history? And we who possess the living Gospel, we, to whom unity is offered as an absolute and essential duty, let us hold fast by the centre clearly marked out for us in those luminous words: “Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.”

CHAPTER VI

ECCLESIASTICAL ILLYRIA

THE five patriarchates, according to the Byzantine idea, were Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, without including the autocephalous province of Cyprus.

It was said that where the patriarchate of Rome ended there that of Constantinople began. This must not be understood to mean that the boundaries were rigidly defined or identified. Towards the end of the sixth century, the patriarchate of Constantinople extended no farther than the ancient diocese of Thrace, and its most easterly provinces were those of Marcianopolis, Thrace, and Rhodopulus. Later on the greater part of Southern Italy, the whole of Sicily, a great many of the isles on the coast of Dalmatia, and all that remained of the Greek provinces in Illyria were annexed to this growing patriarchate. This we learn from various official documents preserved in the archives of the bishops of the period or as historical records.

The most ancient of these documents, the *Παλαιὰ Τακτικά*, seem to date from a period corresponding to that at which Illyria was independent of the Byzantine patriarchal dominion, and the series continues as late as the end of the ninth century. Others, the *Νέα Τακτικά*, which seem to date from about the year 900, represent the ecclesiastical provinces of Illyria, grouped with the other suffragan provinces of Con-

stantinople. It does not seem unlikely, as one of the ancient records (*Notitia I.* of Parthey) goes to prove, that previous to these changes the above-mentioned provinces formed part of the great Roman patriarchate.

Notitia I. after enumerating the bishoprics of the provinces formerly owing allegiance to the Patriarch, goes on to add the seven Sees of Thessalonica, Syracuse, Corinth, Reggio, Nicopolis, Athens, and Patras, saying that they had been detached from the patriarchal diocese of Rome to be joined to that of Constantinople, and this "because the Pope of ancient Rome is now subject to the barbarians." The same may be said, he continues, of the province of Seleucia, detached from the patriarchate of Antioch. Documents, bearing the date of the seventh century, coincide with the historical notices above quoted.

At the Councils of 681 and 692, at Constantinople, the Bishops of Illyria joined the Roman patriarchate. In 692 the Metropolitan of Crete (Gortyne) calls himself "the representative of the entire Synod of the Holy Church of Rome." Finally, in 681, the three Metropolitans of Thessalonica, Corinth, and Crete take the same title.

The acts of supreme jurisdiction exercised in these countries by the Popes appear to have been fairly frequent. Thus, for instance, the Metropolitan of Nicopolis was summoned to Rome in 625 by Honorius, who suspended his election and subjected him to judicial inquiries. In 649 Pope Martin deposed the Metropolitan of Thessalonica, sending him a letter in which he expressly stated that his diocese was subject to the Holy See. Finally, in 668, Pope Vitalian annulled the sentence of deposition which had been formulated by the Metropolitan of

Crete against his suffragan, the Bishop of Lappa. Instances might be multiplied, if the correspondence of the Popes of the seventh century had not been almost entirely destroyed.

Of the remainder of the pontificate of St. Gregory the Great, no fewer than twenty-one letters are in existence, all relating to Western Illyria. One has but to read them to see the position held by the Holy Father in their regard. He sanctions the elections of their bishops, delivers the Roman pallium, and annuls or confirms their decisions when represented to him. He counsels the local clergy in disputed questions concerning the faith, he provides material help to bishops unjustly expelled from their Sees by barbarian invasions—in fact, nothing of importance escapes his eye, and from Sardinia and Scodra to Crete his authority is felt by all. In the exercise of his rights and of his solicitude Gregory seems hindered by no authority whatever. Indeed, one cannot trace even the smallest interference or opposition on the part of the Patriarch of Constantinople, much less on the part of the emperor. On the contrary, the authority of the Pope was even employed by the government in cases where certain laws and rules which might otherwise have had a doubtful reception had to be made known to the Illyrian bishops. Thus, in 591, Gregory sent a circular to the said bishops to strengthen and uphold an imperial decision relating to the maintenance of bishops suffering under barbaric invasions.

In 597 he notified an important regulation concerning the admission of soldiers into Holy Orders and the religious state. This notification was made to all his metropolitans, and is a very remarkable document. These examples are specimens of similar acts

by which the Greek Patriarchs communicated their decisions to their suffragans. This ordeal is mentioned in a great number of the imperial letters; the patriarchal letters corresponding are, however, not to be found, though there must have been many once in existence. Gregory heads his circular by the names of all the persons to whom it is specially addressed. They are the Metropolitans of Thessalonica, Dyrrachium, Milan, Nicopolis, Corinth, Justiniana, Crete, Scodra, Larissa, Ravenna, Cagliari, and the Bishops of Sicily. This list is especially interesting from the fact that it enumerates, with scarcely an exception, the ecclesiastical provinces of the empire depending immediately on the Roman patriarchate.

Transalpine countries situated outside the empire are not on the list at all. Also the metropolitan Sees of Aquila and Salona are omitted, the first, because it was separated through schism, and the latter on account of serious differences with the Holy See.

On the other hand, however, all the episcopal Sees of Italy are mentioned: the provinces of Milan, Ravenna and Cagliari, the Sicilian bishoprics, which, without having a metropolitan organisation, formed a considerable part of the suffragans depending immediately on the Holy See.

For Illyria all the provinces of the south are mentioned: Macedonia, ancient Epirus, modern Epirus, Thessalonica, Achaia, and Crete. But not so in the northern diocese, of which Scodra and Justiniana are named. The barbarians had, in all probability, invaded the other three, viz., Upper Mesia, Fluvial Dacia, and the Mediterranean Dacia. We find the names of these dignitaries of Illyria enrolled without method or order with those of Italy, which may, however, be accounted for if they are chronicled

in order of precedence. They all seem equally dependent on the Vicar of Christ, and he appears to make no more difference between them than the Patriarch of Constantinople made between the Metropolitans of Synnada, Philippopolis, Cyzicus, or Amasis.

There is no question of Africa, and the reason may be that the ecclesiastical organisation of those times considered this continent as more self-governing than Illyria could afford to be. This interpretation of the situation may be further proved by the fact that the Roman Pallium was not sent to the Bishop of Carthage—as far as one can trace by the correspondence of that period.

During the pontificate of St. Gregory, the whole of Illyria seems to have been comprised in the patriarchal province of the Holy See, and to have been as entirely subject to his authority in most matters as an ordinary province is subject to its lawful and ordinary Patriarch. Here we see not only the *fact* but the *right* recognised and acted upon. With the beginning of the eighth century a new state of affairs gradually asserted itself, resulting not in the slightest degree from ecclesiastical causes, but entirely from political reasons.

But how far back in time did this Western extension of the Roman patriarchate reach? The period of twenty-five years which separated Justinian from St. Gregory is represented in the papal archives by a very small correspondence, the letters preserved being few and far between. However, it is well known that Pope Pelagius II. had withdrawn Hadrian, the Bishop of Thebes, in Thessalonica, from the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan of Larissa.

This important event, the consequences of which

were felt under the pontificate of St. Gregory, bears witness that the relationship then in existence was much the same as in his own day. Bearing in mind the state of Italy and of the empire in general from the time of Justinian, and in particular the difficulty of communication resulting from the invasion of the Lombards, we shall not be tempted to assign to this period of history the origin of a like institution. Therefore, it seems natural to conjecture that this origin may date at least from the time of Justinian, and that this prince, who regulated almost as many religious as profane and civil matters, may have instituted or sanctioned the ecclesiastical organisation of Illyria, such as we know it at the end of the sixth century.

It is a somewhat singular fact that the Justinian Code contains a law of Theodosius II., of 14th July 421, which places the provinces of Illyria under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Constantinople. This law is also to be found in the Theodosian Code—from whence it seems that the union of Illyria to the Roman patriarchate was of a later date than the promulgation of the Code (534) and in contradiction to a former state of affairs. But let us examine this point more closely. A few months after the publication of the Code, 14th April 535, the Emperor Justinian addressed a second to Castellianus, Archbishop of Scupi Uskub, declaring that the bishop of this city (hitherto metropolitan of the province of Dardania), should be henceforth archbishop of several provinces. These provinces formerly made up the diocese of Dacia, together with the remains of the empire of Pannonia, which were then almost entirely occupied by savage tribes. The bishops of these countries were declared exempt from all

connection with Thessalonica, which would suppose a pre-existing union.

By way of strengthening the grounds for this change, Justinian points out that the prefecture of Illyria, which formerly had its seat at Sirmium, had been transferred to Thessalonica during the time of Atila, and that from this circumstance had ensued a prerogative for the bishop of the last-named city; but that this same prefecture, being restored by him to Justiniana Prima, it was only fair that ecclesiastical honours should follow civil honours, and that the Bishop of Justiniana Prima should acquire special pre-eminence. This manœuvre was effected by the emperor without intervention of either Pope or Patriarch of Constantinople, and, needless to say, was scarcely sufficient, for naturally, if such legislations corresponded to the relations then existing, the consent of the Patriarch would have been taken into consideration.

If, on the other hand, the Illyrian Churches depended immediately on the Pope, one would expect at least some mention of his name on this occasion. At the very least one would expect to hear that one or other of the two Patriarchs would make himself heard; and such was the case in point of fact, for the Pope entered into negotiations with the emperor.

In answer to an embassy sent by Justinian, Pope St. Agapitus wrote to him on 15th October 535. He nevertheless gave no direct answer concerning the affair of Justiniana Prima, but charged his legates to decide on the subject. Agapitus went himself to Constantinople the following year, but when he died in 536, nothing had been yet decided upon. Things remained in this state until the pontificate

of his successor, Vigilius, who took decisive measures. These measures are investigated in the *Novelle*, 131, of 18th March 545, which regulates the rights of the titular of Justitiana Prima as follows: He shall have under his jurisdiction (with the power of ordination) the bishops of the six provinces of maritime Dacia, Prevalitania, Dardania, and Upper and Lower Pannonia; that he himself shall be elected by his own council; that he shall be the representative of the Holy See of Rome, as defined by the holy Pope Vigilius, in all the provinces of his circumscription.

Without actually entering into the minute details of the powers of vicar and legate, one may be justified in concluding that the idea of their approbation by the Pope is irreconcilable with that of the fact of there having been a possibility of their dating from the law of Theodosius II., reproduced in the Justinian Code. If this had been the genuine expression of the real relations, they would have asked for a delegation not from the Pope but from the Patriarch. The idea of addressing themselves to the Pope on this occasion would have been less natural in 535, from the fact that, when the negotiations began to take place under Agapitus, Rome was still subject to the King of the Goths.

To break with secular tradition, irritate the Byzantine clergy by considerably diminishing the territory of the Patriarch, and that simply for the benefit of distant ecclesiastical authority, would indeed have been to act with little prudence. Therefore it is clearly more natural to agree that the organisation we see at work, after Justinian, should date from before his time, and that the Theodosian law, even thus corroborated by its insertion in the Code, is contradictory to tradition.

But there are other reasons for this belief. The letter of Pope Agapitus also contained certain explanations bearing on the partiality towards Constantinople exhibited in a sentence pronounced by the Holy See upon a bishop named Stephen. The sentence could not have been different without sanctioning contempt for the appeal to the Roman Pontiff.

To this must be added the ordination of another bishop, named Achilles, brought about in opposition to the wishes of the Holy See by Epiphanius at the emperor's command. The legates received full powers to decide these questions.

It would appear from this letter that Stephen had been deposed by the Patriarch of Constantinople, who installed Achilles in his stead. The See in question is not categorically named in the letter, but it is clearly situated within the imperial territory, and in a country where there might be conflict between the Patriarch and the Pope, namely, in Illyria.

All agree that the bishop, Stephen, was no other than the one whose affairs were treated of in Rome in 531 under Boniface II. The minutes of the ecclesiastical process have been transmitted to us in an ancient tenth-century manuscript of Bobbio, preserved in the Vatican archives, No. 5751. Unfortunately it is incomplete, breaking off in the second session of the Council.

A certain bishop had been elected to the See of Larissa. Some people appear to have regarded his election as irregular; the matter was put before Epiphanius, Patriarch of Constantinople, who declared it to be null. Stephen then urged that the case in point did not come under the jurisdiction of

the Patriarch, and appealed to the Pope's tribunal at Rome. The Patriarch, nevertheless, disregarded this appeal, and summoned Stephen to Constantinople, where he was forced to appear before the patriarchal court, which unfrocked him and threw him into prison. Fortunately for the prisoner he had a friend in Theodosius of Echinæus, who set out immediately for Rome, furnished with letters from Stephen and various other documents, among which may be mentioned a collection of pontifical letters and of other writings which were of a nature to establish the fact that Illyria did not belong to the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Constantinople at all, but to the Pope.

Theodosius demanded that these letters should be read and verified by comparing them with the original papal documents preserved in the Vatican, which privilege was accorded to him. Unfortunately the account of the trial is here interrupted towards the end of the twenty-sixth section, so that neither the verifications nor the continuation of the debates have come down to us. M. Freidrich, in a memoir published in 1891 in the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Academy of Munich, pages 771 to 887, argues against the authenticity of this collection. He discusses several of the papers contained in it, but does not state at all clearly what he accepts or what he rejects. Thus he omits to say whether he considers the whole account of the proceedings of the Council to be fabricated or authentic; or whether he believes in the letters to Pope Boniface from the Bishop of Larissa; and he gives no probable date for the supposed falsification. As to this matter, he simply remarks that the correspondence of the Popes Nicolas I. and Adrian I. already depended

upon falsified documents and therefore he supposes their existence. The law of 14th July 421, is, for him, the true expression of the hierarchical organisation of Illyria both before and after the year 531. To this decree he refers all the documents in question, and mercilessly rejects all that tend to show that the Pope may have had any special jurisdiction over these countries.

True it is, too, that he quietly ignores the voluminous correspondence on the subject of St. Gregory and his successors of the seventh century as well as the Councils and the episcopal notices of the same period. It is not worth our while to follow from point to point a discussion that is so incomplete and wanting in precision. It suffices to note the following facts:—

I. If the Roman Council of 531 was invented, either wholly or in part, it must admittedly have been fabricated in defence of the Holy See's rights over Western Illyria. But these rights had been exercised entirely without opposition from the time of Justinian. The forger would then have had to work under this prince with a view to influencing either his or the Pope's mind. For this he would have needed to be exceedingly skilful. His documents are dated December 531, therefore the falsehood cannot go back farther than 532. And yet the impression they were desired to produce was actually produced three years afterwards on the person of Pope Agapitus, one of the most important members of the Roman clergy even before the time of Boniface II., a man of letters, of noble lineage, and a friend of Cassiodorus. This is the person, they would argue, by whom false coin was accepted as genuine, newly concocted documents

believed in as true, when he had in his own archives the means of detecting their forgery. Moreover, they cannot plead that the Pope may have himself been an accomplice in such underhand work, without at the same time introducing the imperial government and the patriarchate of Constantinople into the affair, or without granting the fact of their having been easily deceived by these impostures. That in fact, in order to conform themselves to the pretended letters of the Pope, they abandoned their rights and traditions. *Credat Judæus Apella!*

II. Such suspected documents seem scarcely likely to find their way into the Latin collections of canon law. They have reference to a particular country and that under quite special conditions. As it is, the pontifical letters forming the privileges of the Church of Arles are kept in a separate collection, and were not considered as forming part of the canonical writings of the times of the Merovingians.

There are, however, exceptions. Of the twenty-two letters put into the collection of Theodosius, three at least cannot be called apocryphal, as they are to be found elsewhere as well as in the collection. And the others can hardly be discredited from the simple fact that they are not there.

III. A letter of St. Leo relating to the vicariate of Thessalonica and to the ecclesiastical organisation of Illyria is to be seen outside of and apart from the collections of 531. Treating as it does of several points of discipline, it had been placed in several canonical books. That it is not in the *Vaticanus*, 5751, may be accounted for by the mutilation of this MSS. It is interrupted just in the middle of the letters of St. Leo.

It is perfectly evident that, if this letter is authentic, no shadow of doubt can possibly be cast upon the collection of 531. M. Friedrich has done his best to contradict this. According to him, it had been made up under the pontificate of Pope Hormisdas, about 517. But, putting aside any intrinsic difficulties in proving this, the extrinsic difficulties are many and grave.

The letter in question is in the collection of Denis the Short, as well as in the Freiburg MSS. collection and the Guesnel collection. All three of these collections are exceedingly ancient. Two of them date probably from the year 500, and the collection of Denis cannot be much more recent. M. Friedrich only speaks of the Denis collection, and ignores the evidence borne by the other two, while he repeatedly insists that the forging of false letters and the concocting of sham councils were common practices of the sixth century. He forgets to add that not a single false letter has ever found its way into the collection of Decretals formed by Denis, and that the letter to which he so much objects would have been the first apocryphal epistle to be cast out.

IV. Mommsen, in his *Neues Archiv*, fully approves of Friedrich's argument, but insists on one point only, the style of two imperial letters contained in the collection of Theodosius.

These letters refer to the law of 14th July 421. In the first, Honorius transmits to Theodosius II. a complaint of the Pope's concerning the violation of certain rights of the Holy See in Illyricum. This letter is addressed to Theodosius. In the second, Theodosius replies to Honorius that the Pope's request will be attended to, and that orders

to this effect have been given to the prefect of the province of Illyria.

Mommsen judges, and rightly, that these documents are not drawn up in the form customary in legal acts, and that they should at least be headed by the names of the two emperors.

To this we may answer:—

(a) No one knows how these documents were entitled, as the original superscriptions do not exist. The collection omits them and replaces them by titles evidently composed by the collector himself: *Exemplar epistolæ piissimi imp. Honorii ad Theodosium aug.—Rescript. Theodosii aug. ad Honorium aug.*

(b) The letters in question are nowhere given in the collection of 531 as legislative acts, but simply as expressing the personal determination of the two emperors.

(c) A legislative act is referred to the rescript of Theodosius: *ad viros illustres præfectos prætorii Illyrici, nostri scripta porreximus, ut cessantibus, &c.* But this is not to be found in the collection.

If Theodosius's dispositions had not changed after his letter to Honorius, this edict would be found in the Theodosian Code, and not in the one of 14th July 421. In any case he is the man from whom we should expect the legal formalities which M. Mommsen appears surprised not to find in our rescript.

V. Among the suspected documents there exists an entire series which mentions a Metropolitan of Corinth, named Perigenus, who, though chosen to occupy the See of Patras by his predecessor, had not been accepted by the faithful of that town. He returned to Corinth and pleaded his cause with the

Holy Father, who, on the death of the metropolitan, installed him in the latter See. Though the documents concerning Perigenus are to be found nowhere except in this collection, the circumstances concerning his promotion are mentioned in Socrates' *Ecclesiastical History*.

This agreement is no small proof of authenticity, and M. Friedrich, in order to extricate himself from the dilemma, is forced to conjecture that the "forger" drew his inspiration from the translation of Socrates by Epiphanius the Scholastic. But this translation can hardly be earlier than the year 540, which would place the falsification at a date which would make it useless.

VI. When a forger, writing a full century after the events he is describing, allows himself to introduce proper names into his productions, it is highly probable that he will make some considerable mistakes, unless the dates and persons he quotes are exceedingly well known. In the collection under consideration this is not the case. One meets with names of Bishops of Thessalonica and of various other prelates of Illyria, and frequently these names occur among the signatories to the decrees of the Œcumenical Councils of 431 and 451. Pope Boniface, writing to Rufus of Thessalonica (J. 363), names at least five Bishops of Thessalonica without indicating their Sees, viz., Perrevious, Pausianus, Cyriacus, Calliopus, and Maximus. The letter is dated A.D. 422. Three of these prelates assisted at the Council of Ephesus—Perrevious on the orthodox side, Pausianus and Maximus on that of Nestorius.

It so happens that in the above letter the Pope defends Perrevious, whilst he pronounces ecclesiastical censures against the others. This coincidence is

surely sufficiently remarkable to deserve notice. The Thessalian bishops regarded as disreputable in 422 at Rome appear in the opposing Council of 431.

The letter (J. 366) is addressed by Pope Celestine to nine Illyrian bishops. Of these five are identified by the signatures of the Council of Ephesus and by other documents as the Metropolitans of Corinth, Nicopolis, Larissa, Scodra, and Sardinia. Besides this the letter mentions Rufus of Thessalonica and Felix, Metropolitan of Dyrrachium, and we may well believe that the four remaining prelates are the Metropolitans of the four other provinces, Crete, Mesia, the Dardanelles, and littoral Dacia.

The letter (J. 404) is a circular addressed to various Metropolitans of Illyria. It was written by St. Leo in the year 446, and of the six names first mentioned in it, three are from other evidence known to be those of the Metropolitans of Scodra (Senecio) Dyrrachium (Lucas), and Larissa (Vigilantius). Atticus, Metropolitan of Nicopolis, about whom the letter (J. 141), was written, also doubted by M. Friedrich, appears with his title among the signatories of the Councils of Ephesus, 449, and Calcedon, 451. Practically it may be said, without hesitation, that, with very rare exceptions, the names of all the bishops mentioned in the incriminated documents are verified by the acts of contemporary Councils, and that the remaining names are not excluded by any evidence whatever. This fact is hardly reconcilable with the theory of falsification. In addition to this the consular notes agree with the actual records, and the formulæ and style are in perfect accordance with the customs of the pontifical chancery of the time.

There is in reality nothing whatever to be said

against these letters, unless it is that they do not accord with a special system in the ecclesiastical organisation of Illyria. We have, therefore, no right to disregard the documents doubted by M. Friedrich. The history of the ecclesiastical organisation of Eastern Illyria will remain such as it has been hitherto.

From the time of the first Theodosius, the Pope Siricius confided to the Bishop of Thessalonica superiority over the episcopate of these provinces, and the vicariate thus established continued its operations until the rupture between the Greek Church and Pope Felix III. in 484.¹

It was a cause of dispute between the Patriarchs of Constantinople, Atticus and Proclus, twice at least during the first century of its existence. It was during the episcopate of Atticus, and undoubtedly at his instigation, that the law contrary to the papal possession was published on 14th July 421, and during the episcopate of Proclus, the Theodosian Code appeared in which this law had been inserted. But in spite of both law and code the Popes succeeded in maintaining their right. This state of things was interfered with by the schism caused by affairs in Acacia (484–519), the Bishops of Thessalonica, who maintained the same attitude as the Byzantine bishops, consequently lost communion with the Pope, as a matter of course.

From henceforth there could be no question of allowing them the rights of vicars-apostolic. It would seem that during this period the Patriarchs

¹ Pope Hilary, again, treated the Bishop of Thessalonica as his vicar, as is proved by a literary fragment (Jaffé 565) which the *Regesta Pontificum* has mistakenly relegated to a place among apocryphal writings.

of Constantinople gave up all attempt at annexation. Illyria was left to itself, the Popes merely endeavouring to do their utmost to preserve from the schism a certain number of episcopal centres which were disposed to remain loyal to the pontifical authority. Thus Gelasius resumed relations with the bishops of the Dardanelles and the neighbouring provinces, which, being Latin countries, were more accessible and more amenable to the counsels of the Apostolic See. These relations were maintained, for we find a letter (J. 763) of Pope Symmachus addressed to the bishops of these countries. Anastasius II. exchanged letters with the Bishop of Lychnidos in New Epirus. Previous to the death of the Emperor Anastasius the province of ancient Epirus had, through the intervention of its metropolitan, Aleyson, Bishop of Nicopolis, returned to communion with the Apostolic See, and this not without a certain amount of risk. The Emperor Anastasius was annoyed, and sent for the Bishops of Nicopolis, Lychnidos, Sardinia, Náissus, and Pantalia to come to Constantinople, where two of them died, of whom the Metropolitan Aleyson was one.

At this juncture an important manifestation of the Bishops of Illyria took place. Forty bishops of these regions, indignant as they naturally were on hearing that the Metropolitan of Thessalonica had entered into communion with Timothy, the intruded Patriarch of Constantinople, met and formulated a solemn declaration by which they publicly broke off all relations with him, and re-entered into communion with Rome.

In relating this incident, Theodore the Reader gives the title of Patriarch to the Bishop of Thessalonica, which seems greatly to astonish Theophanes

to whom we are indebted for this fragment of Theodore. Theodore cannot be said to have been altogether in the wrong, for it is not impossible that the title of Patriarch may have been given to the Bishop of Thessalonica, or at any rate adopted by him. The title itself had not, at that time, the special signification given to it later on, and thus one hears of its being bestowed on the Bishops of Tyre, Hierapolis, and Phrygia.

It is, moreover, certain that the authority exercised by the Bishops of Thessalonica over the metropolitans and other prelates of Illyria very much resembled patriarchal jurisdiction. It differed from it in one point alone, viz., that whereas patriarchal jurisdiction was ordinary, *i.e.* inherent in any special See, the jurisdiction of Thessalonica was only delegated, for it was the patriarchal jurisdiction of the Pope exercised by his Holiness's special permission to the bishop.

The union with Rome once broken (484) the delegated powers ceased *ipso facto*. The Bishops of Thessalonica made many and great efforts to escape the consequences naturally resulting from this separation. From the time of Felix III., Andrew, who then occupied the See, endeavoured to be again united with Rome without losing favour with the government. The task was no easy one, and he failed. His successor, Dorotheus, began by showing the same disposition, but the clergy of Thessalonica were already influenced by theological opinions unlikely to promote schemes for union. When the empire at last submitted to Pope Hormisdas (519) resistance was still prolonged for a time at Thessalonica and hostile feeling ran so high that the papal legates sent from Rome to celebrate the reconciliation were personally assaulted.

Dorotheus was responsible for these disorders, but their chief instigator was a priest named Aristides against whom Pope Hormisdas had shown much irritation. Hormisdas wished that Dorotheus should be deposed, on condition that his place should not be filled by Aristides. The dispute cooled down, however, though we are not informed how or when. Suffice it to say that Dorotheus remained bishop, and that his successor was none other than Aristides. Prelates such as these were not the men the Popes would choose to represent them, especially in times when the monophysite party were still powerful though vanquished, and were ever trying by various devices to regain the position lost to them in 519. To tolerate Dorotheus and Aristides for the sake of peace and to avoid a greater evil was just possible, but to go so far as to allow such suspected characters as these to represent the authority of the Holy See in the midst of a divided episcopate and to act as its legates in such delicate circumstances, would have been a grave act of imprudence. Therefore we shall look in vain for any trace of a delegation of powers, or of an apostolic vicariate, in the time of Dorotheus and Aristides. Relations were re-established between Rome and Thessalonica, that was all. In other ways things, after 519, were just as they had been during the schism.

In the trial of Stephen of Larissa in 531 the ancient documents of the vicariate of Thessalonica were brought forward, not to bear witness to the actual existence of the trial, but as proof of the special authority exercised by the Pope over Illyria. The letters of Stephen himself and those of his suffragans do not mention Thessalonica as exercising intermediary jurisdiction between the metropolitans and

the patriarchal authority. The debate is restricted to the Pope and the Bishop of Constantinople. The question is, to which of the two does it belong to confirm the election of the Metropolitan of Larissa?

Thessalonica is mentioned, and there it is that we find Stephen when he had been joined by the emissaries of the Patriarch. He went there, perhaps, for counsel and advice, and possibly the documents of Theodosius come from there, but certain it is that the Bishop of Thessalonica kept clear of the whole affair. In spite of all that has been said, Thessalonica enjoyed certain ecclesiastical honours. Justinian alludes to them in his *Novelle II.*, and connects them with the transference of the prefecture: *Tunc ipsam præfecturam et sacerdotalis honor secutus est et Thessalonicensis episcopus non sua auctoritate sed sub umbra præfecturæ meruit aliquam prærogativam.*

Here it is necessary to distinguish between the fact and the explanation of the fact. Justinian declares the See of Thessalonica to be in possession of a certain prerogative, which prerogative was, he explains, that the Bishop of Smyrna had jurisdiction over it. But it is impossible to find any trace of the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Sirmium in Eastern Illyria, therefore Justinian is certainly mistaken on this point. But he is not wrong in attributing to the neighbourhood of the prefecture the honours given to the See of Thessalonica.

Thessalonica, both on account of its own importance and also from the fact of its being the residence of the first magistrate of all Illyria, was the most conspicuous and noteworthy town in these countries. Its bishop was, moreover, the head of a numerous clergy and of a great Christian population. The

tendency of those days, especially in the East, to make the ecclesiastical authority coincide with the civil administration, led to giving him an importance analogous to that of the Bishops of Antioch, Ephesus, and Cæsarea in Cappadocia. He occupied the first rank in the ancient Councils.

But, passing from the question of honours to that of jurisdiction, we find that no regulations whatever were made by any Council concerning the position of the Bishop of Thessalonica which was defined only by the pontifical vicariate. This vicariate, after having exercised its functions for nearly one hundred years, ceased to exist for seventy or eighty. But it was neither probable nor possible that no trace should remain of relations that had existed during a century. Naturally it sometimes happened that insignificant disagreements arose between the metropolitans and the vicars who held the place of the Pope, but, on the whole, the inferiors fully recognised the authority of their superiors.

The See of Thessalonica was one of the central points of these relations with Rome, and metropolitans always at least notified their accession to its bishop. But during the schism the Popes forbade the bishops of the Latin provinces, of the Dardanelles, and others to conform to this custom. When the bishops of ancient Epirus returned to the Roman communion they were also forbidden to do so. It must not be imagined that this notification of their accession on the part of the metropolitans implied the least dependence or subordination. It was a sign of ecclesiastical inter-communion, and nothing more.

When Pope Hormisdas forbade it to the Bishops of Epirus, he was preoccupied by one thing only,

that was the question of communion. And if, in one of his letters, he introduces the word "confirmation," he does so without dwelling on the special sense of that word. As a matter of fact, when any bishop, to whom a colleague writes to notify his election, acknowledges the letter he may be said to "confirm" the election. In a word, one may say that what best remained to the See of Thessalonica was the remembrance of its pre-eminence in the former century, and the deep conviction that, peace once made with the Holy Father, this pre-eminence would inevitably return. This conviction was doubtless right. Pope Hormisdas himself, writing to Bishop Dorotheus of Thessalonica, reproaches him for not following the example of the other bishops who had returned to the communion of the Holy See, when he ought to have set them the example in this matter: *Quod debueras primus assumere*. Later on the Pope blames him for presuming to use pontifical privileges even while in revolt against Rome: *Quo pudore, rogo, privilegia circa te illorum manere desideras quorum mandata non servas?* Pope Hormisdas further instructs his legates, in the event of Dorotheus' returning to communion with the Church of Rome, to restore to him his rights and privileges: *Certe redeat ad unitatem, et nos cum eo insistemus, ut omnia privilegia, quaecumque consecuta est a sede apostolica ecclesia ejus, inviolata servantur*.

It may be said, in passing, that these expressions refer to the old pontifical vicariate and to its rights and privileges. Unfortunately these good intentions of the Holy Father were without visible result, for the Bishop of Thessalonica showed an uncongenial attitude and refused to respond.

In 535 the bishop found himself in the position already described, as the most important metropolitan of Illyria, whose See was also the seat of prefecture. As regards higher ecclesiastical jurisdiction, properly so called, there remained but the remembrance—*magni nominis umbram*.

Such was the state of things when Justinian set about rebuilding the ancient city of Scupi (Uskub) calling it by his own name. He decided that the Bishop of Justiniana Prima should hold the rank of a superior metropolitan in regard to the ecclesiastical provinces of ancient Dacia. This affair he submitted to Pope Agapitus, and about the year 545 it was definitely regulated by Pope Vigilius.

This newly founded primacy was organised under the form of an apostolic vicariate, somewhat similar to that of the Bishop of Arles and to that which had existed a century before in Thessalonica. Little is known of this new vicariate. Among the correspondence of St. Gregory there is often question of the authority of the Pope in Illyria, but rarely of that of his vicars. However, there exist papers relating to the powers conferred on John of Justiniana Prima; and letters addressed to the Metropolitans of Sardinia and Scodra, subordinate to the vicar, also mention these powers. A very severe letter, addressed to the bishop himself, who had prevaricated in passing judgment, also speaks of them. No bishop of this See is heard of later than the time of St. Gregory. The Bishop of Thessalonica was himself also a vicar of the Pope. This fact is worth mentioning, as it is far from clearly alluded to in the correspondence of St. Gregory. Hardly a single passage from his letters so much as hints at a superiority exercised

by this prelate over the other metropolitans of Central Illyria. In the seventh century the Bishop of Thessalonica had the title of vicar, and Pope Martin severely reproaches one of them for not so subscribing himself in his letters. At the sixth Œcumenical Council the Bishop of Thessalonica, in addition to his title of "legate" of the Holy See signs himself "vicar," the former title being borne by the Bishops of Corinth, Gortygna, Athens, Reggio, and Tempsa as well, while that of "vicar" was peculiar to himself. In fact, the Bishop of Thessalonica, in this instance, ranks second to none below the Patriarchs in dignity. To recapitulate:—

1. Until the middle of the eighth century the ecclesiastical provinces of Eastern Illyria were considered as forming part of the Roman patriarchate. If at rare intervals, towards the end of the fifth and beginning of the sixth centuries, some fruitless attempts were made to attach these provinces to the See of Constantinople, they completely ceased after the arrangements made between the Pope and the Emperor Justinian.

2. From the fifth century to the schism in 484, the Popes exercised their authority over this part of their spiritual dominions through the intermediary of the Bishop of Thessalonica, whom they entitled vicar.

3. About the year 484 the vicariate entirely disappeared, and the tactics employed by the Emperors Zeno and Anastasius consisted chiefly in putting forward every possible obstacle to hinder the direct patriarchal jurisdiction of the Pope.

4. Under Justinian the vicariate again reappeared, and was divided between the two Metropolitans of Justiniana Prima and Thessalonica. But

the title being, practically, merely honorary, the Pope directly exercised his powers as Patriarch.

In this part of the world, as in many others, the reign of Justinian marks an epoch, and his practical genius found new outlets here in which to exercise itself. From his time, Illyria and Italy were both subject to the same government. It was no easy task for the Pope to make his authority respected so long as there were two political powers to be obeyed. But from Justinian's reign they became united, and the vicariate, which had been instituted under other circumstances, after losing its practical utility, passed to the rank of an ecclesiastical decoration only.

NOTE

In the *Neues Archiv*, tom. xix. pp. 433-435, M. Mommsen comes back to the question of imperial letters shown in the Thessalonican collection. This time he distinguishes between the collection considered in itself and the authenticity of the two letters of Theodosius II. and Honorius. These latter appear to him to be false, but the fact that two such letters, written at a very remote date, are found in the collection, does not, he thinks, affect the value of the collection.

I might declare myself perfectly satisfied, but I do not see why the two letters are necessarily to be cast aside. I own, with M. Mommsen, and I have never denied the fact, that these letters are not legislative texts, nor are they acts of public administration. They are personal letters, not in familiar style, but letters in which emperors do not come forward as organs of imperial authority as yet unformulated in theory.

Translator's Note.—I have ventured to omit the remainder of the author's footnote, which covers four pages, and is unnecessary for the general purposes of his argument.

CHAPTER VII

THE CHRISTIAN MISSIONS SOUTH OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE

IN this chapter I have collected together a series of studies on the propagation of Christianity in the regions bordering upon the Roman frontier in Africa and Arabia, extending from the ocean to the Persian Gulf and the Euphrates. It has not occurred to me to attempt to teach Orientalists, who have already studied the matter for themselves, nor do I flatter myself that my solutions on all points are unassailable. Documents are for ever accumulating. Letronne was better instructed than either Renaudot or Lequien could have been ; since Letronne's time the writings of many authors and many inscriptions have been either discovered and published for the first time, or at least better explained. I simply wish to show the results achieved at the present stage of our discoveries and researches, hoping that newer discoveries still may soon improve upon what I am now writing.

I

THE SAHARA

Roman civilisation was a long way from subjugating the entire north of Africa, and from assimilating its inhabitants and institutions. Excepting the

oriental provinces of Africa and Numidia, all the mountainous region west of the Aures, the plains overlooked by the Tell, and even certain parts of the coast, remained, after the annexation of Mauritania, in very much the same condition as regards culture as they were before.

Nothing could be more vague than the so-called boundaries of the province at the southern extremity. Between the towns of Tell, nomadic tribes were occasionally to be found, who peopled these districts, Mauritaniens, as they were called, who formed part of the provincial system, through the intermediary of their national chiefs. The plains were occupied by the Getuli, a nearly independent population, who spread over the Sahara and the country west of the Atlas, *i.e.* the present Moroccan Empire.

There existed, however, between these peoples and the masters of the regions bordering on the sea, much the same relations as at the present day, as far as commerce is concerned, such relationship being regulated by the nature of the soil and of the climate. Tax-gatherers, recruiting officers, and military expeditions penetrated for a considerable distance into the interior. From time to time the barbarian vassals of the empire raided the territory already occupied, and pushed forward their incursions as far as the coast. Some went so far as to cross the Straits of Gades and to sack the rich province of Betica. In short, whether subject, tributary, or independent, the Berber tribes represented a very considerable native population, careful to preserve all that distinguished them from the Romans, and capable of transforming the distinction into opposition and the opposition eventually into hostility. When at last the Roman power began to

decline, the Mauritanian sway soon made itself felt.

From the fourth century the Moors showed their power, and forced the empire to take account of them, detaining by force part of the troops sent to preserve order. In face of the Vandals in the fifth century they not only maintained their position, but strengthened it. The Byzantine occupation in the following century was even more transient than the Vandal establishment had been. Berberan Africa extended itself gradually, and strengthened itself, in spite of transmarine colonisation. From a religious point of view, the culture of the Moors was originally of the simplest description; in fact, under the Roman Empire they worshipped hardly any gods but their former kings. Christianity, according to Tertullian, found its way to them in the third century.

However this may be, we find a certain number of the African bishoprics in the fourth and fifth centuries belonging to Moorish localities. It is not easy to discover the exact time when the Gospel was preached in these parts. Monuments and inscriptions prove that political fluctuations, notably the changes in the Roman frontier, did not in any way influence Moorish religion. The Moors themselves were converted at the same time as the Roman populations, and we occasionally see, at the time of the Donatists, a Moorish prince, in common with the officers of the empire, taking the part of one communion or another. In fact, the history of the evangelisation of this part of the coast is identical with the history of the evangelisation of the rest of Africa. We know of no particular Apostle of the Moors, nor do we find any church

or ecclesiastical organisation peculiar to this people. Christianity was introduced little by little, and by degrees bishoprics were founded in various provinces. But their Church always remained the Church of Africa.

II

NUBIA

To the north of the Egyptians, between them and the country of the negroes, the valley of the Nile was inhabited by the dark-skinned Ethiopian tribes, who were also somewhat nearly related to the Egyptians and to the primitive inhabitants of Abyssinia. These Ethiopians called their tribe by the name of Kasch or Kousch, which name is found in the Bible.

The Egyptian conquest was the means by which civilisation was carried into this country. This conquest, with the exception of a few expeditions directed towards the south, hardly passed the confluent of the Blue Nile, a little below which the town of Meroé arose. A religious centre was established at Napata (Muraoni), down the river, near the Fourth Cataract, with a great sanctuary connected with Theban worship. There also was the capital of the political establishment. From being originally the vassal of Egypt, Ethiopia was at length in a position to give masters to this country, and only after many troubles and vicissitudes did the destinies of these two countries separate.

From the time of the reign of Psammetichus the Ethiopians lived in their own country. At the Roman conquest the reigning dynasty, which was chiefly represented by queens bearing the title of

Kandaké, resided at Napata, but the more southern part of the Ethiopian state had for its capital Meroé.

Under Augustus, a detachment of the Roman army, commanded by Petronius, the Prefect of Egypt, was brought into the country owing to a frontier difficulty. As a result of this expedition it was arranged that the provincial territory should not extend farther than the First Cataract, the traditional boundary of Egypt. However, along the southern extremity, lines of Roman posts were planted the whole length of Dodécaschène to Hiéra Sykaminas.

About the end of the third century two robber tribes were to be found on this frontier, probably akin in race to the Blemmyes and the Nobades. These latter no doubt owed their name to Napata, and represented, though in a much less civilised degree, the ancient Ethiopians of Napata and Meroé. At this period they distinguished themselves by their raids in the oasis of the Libyan desert. As for the Blemmyes, of still more barbarous manners and customs, they attacked the Egyptian frontier on the south-east, and the towns in the valley of the Nile. They are generally ranked with the Bicharri and the Bedja of the present day, who inhabit the lands comprised between the Great Nile, the Blue Nile, the mountains of Abyssinia, the Red Sea, and on to the Egyptian deserts. The Emperor Diocletian decided, by way of keeping his dangerous neighbours quiet, to give up to them the Dodécaschène, so that they became next-door neighbours to the Egyptians.

The Blemmyes installed themselves near to the frontier. Among other agreements is to be found their right to the worship of Isis in the temple of Philæ, with express permission at certain times to carry the statue of the goddess into the interior of

their country. This custom the Blemmyes kept up even after the empire had become converted to Christianity when the temples were closed. The most pious among the emperors, such as Marcian and even Justinian, were obliged to leave open the doors of the temple of Philæ. The treaties required it.

The Nobadians and the Blemmyes were only converted at a very late period. There lived, about the year 543, in the household of Theodosius, the monophysite Patriarch of Alexandria, a priest called Julian, who conceived the idea of devoting his life to the evangelisation of the Nobadians. This project was encouraged by the Empress Theodora. Justinian, who would have preferred orthodox missionaries, succeeded in sending some, but Julian arrived before them, presented himself to Silko, the king of the Nobades, and not only induced him to embrace monophysite errors, but also brought about the expulsion of the orthodox missionaries sent by the emperor. Thus the conversion of the Nobades was effected under the auspices of the Patriarch Theodosius, who was considered the chief and leader of the Monophysites, and of their acknowledged protectress, the Empress Theodora.

Julian remained two years in the midst of his neophytes, whom he eventually committed to the care of Bishop Theodore of Philæ. He then returned to Constantinople, and this state of affairs continued for some years. It was during this interval that the date of the foundation of a Church at Dendour, near Kalabscheh (Talmis), is placed.

A Coptic inscription mentioning Bishop Theodore of Philæ as chief ecclesiastical authority in the matter, possibly about the year 559, preserves the memory of the event. Silko was then no longer king of

the Nobades. An ancient inscription gives their sovereign the name of Eirpanome.

In 567, shortly before his death, Theodosius designated as his successor and director of the Nubian mission, Longinus, another of his priests, who was only consecrated bishop. But the imperial police detained him at Constantinople for three years more. He succeeded in making his escape in 569, and rejoined the faithful, in whose midst he lived for six years. In 575 we find him in Egypt deeply engaged in the disputes of the monophysite party. About this time the envoys of the king of the Nobades, coming to Constantinople, brought glowing accounts of the newly converted kingdom and highly praised their apostle, Longinus. Not only in the great towns of the empire was he spoken of, but the news of the conversion of the Nobades travelled also far south in the direction of the people of the Alodes, who having heard what had taken place declared their wish to embrace the Christian religion. Their king wrote to Awarfioula, the king of the Nobades, asking him to send Longinus.

The latter was at this time in Alexandria, engaged in supporting the Patriarch Theodore, whom he had himself consecrated, in opposition to his rival, Peter by name, who had been elected by the people of Alexandria. In the middle of this schism, which greatly agitated the Monophysites of Egypt and the empire, the envoys of the king of the Nobades arrived and reclaimed their spiritual chief. The partisans of Peter attempted to lay hands on the neophytes of the Upper Nile, but they stood firm. Awarfioula's emissaries would hear of no one but Longinus, and rejected the two bishops and their attendants who had been sent by Peter to the Alodians.

In the meantime Longinus had returned to the Nobades, whom he soon left to go to his new mission. He had no little trouble in reaching his destination, for he had to make his way through the country of the Makourites, whose king, being badly disposed towards him, set guards on all the roads, as far as to the Red Sea. Awarfioula sent the bishop to the king of the Blemmyes, under whose protection he managed to cross that dangerous country, not however without having much to suffer from heat and thirst. He himself fell ill, and lost seventeen camels. Arrived at length at the frontier of the Alodes, he was received by a functionary called Itiko, who conducted him with great pomp to the king, who received him with enthusiasm, asked to be instructed, and finally received baptism with a great number of his people. The news of this happy event reached the king of the Nobades two hundred days after the departure of the missionary. Messengers from Longinus brought a letter from the king of the Alodes and one from Longinus himself, who begged him to forward it to Alexandria.

The Nobadian king sent these documents to the Patriarch Theodore, with a letter written in his own name. These documents have been preserved for us by John of Ephesus. This took place about the year 579.

The Makourites, of whom mention has just been made, can be no other than those who sent an embassy to Constantinople about the same time. John of Biclar registers this fact as occurring in the seventh year of the reign of Justin II. (v. 573): *Legati gentis Maccurritarum Constantinopolim veniunt, dentes elephantinos et camelopardam Justino principi munera offerentes sibi cum Romanis amicitias*

collocant. The country of Muqurra or Makouria is sometimes identified with Nubia, and sometimes presented as one of its subdivisions near the Second Cataract. This situation, it is true, scarcely agrees with the accounts and documents of John of Asia; from these we might infer that the Makourites lived to the south of the Nobades. They could, in fact, bar the passage of the Nile and even station their posts up to the Red Sea; but on this side, by passing through the country of the Blemmyes and getting an escort from them it was possible to escape.

As to the Alodes, they must have been neighbours of the Abyssinians; for Longinus remarks in his letter that he had enlightened some Axoumitans, who had adopted the fantastic errors of Julian of Halicarnassus. One can hardly help connecting their name with the town of Aloa, now in ruins, which flourished on the right bank of the Blue Nile, a few miles from Khartoum. Aloa was built on the site of Meroé. It was until the fifteenth century the capital of a Christian State, and its ruins still bear some traces of Christianity. It was probably with these Nubians that Abyssinia had had to deal during the fifth century, in the reign of the Negus Ezana, son of Ela-Amida. Their expedition against the High Plateaux ended in a defeat, which was followed by an invasion of the Axoumites, who also were victorious. On the Noba, at the confluent of the Atbara and the Nile, they plundered the country of Merv and seized several of the towns, among others Aloa.

As to the Blemmyes, it seems probable that their conversion took place before that of the Alodes. There had been long-standing quarrels between them and the Nobades. We are told something

of the relations existing between them by a curious and now celebrated Greek inscription found at Talmis. It dates from the conversion of the Nobades: "Silko, King of the Nobades and of all the Ethiopians"—then follows the description, in pompous language, of all the victories he won "by God's help" over the Blemmyes, and the terms of peace to which he made them swear "on their idols."

From this time the Blemmyes were placed between two Christian States, of which the Roman, the more friendly of the two, succeeded in putting an end to the functions of the Temple of Isis. This sanctuary was closed in the latter part of Justinian's reign, and in 577 Bishop Theodore changed it into a church. The inscriptions commemorating this event may be seen to this day. There might easily have been a coincidence between the closing of the temple of Philæ and the conversion of the Blemmyes.

These Blemmyes, at the time of the mission of Longinus among the Alodes, were on good terms with the king of the Nobades, or, at any rate, were strongly influenced by him. M. E. Révillout conjectures, not without reason, that Silko's victories over the Blemmyes may have had the effect of evicting them from the valley of the Nile and of driving them into the interior of the country, in the direction where their descendants are now thought to be found, *i.e.* between the Nile and the Red Sea.

After these accounts of the missions, darkness closes over the religious history of the Upper Nile for a time. Numerous epitaphs, in Greek or in Coptic, may be seen in different parts of this country, between Talmis in ancient Dodécaschène and Wadi-Gazal, beyond the Fourth Cataract near

to ancient Napata. They are mostly of the seventh and eighth centuries, and the greater number (following a custom which reminds us of the ancient Egyptian manner of burying the dead), with a copy of the funeral ritual containing extracts of the burial liturgy according to the rite of Constantinople. This latter circumstance, united with the peculiar construction of the Greek language used, agrees with what John of Asia tells us of the origin of Christianity in Nubia. Other Christian remains are also to be met with, as far as the environs of Khartoum.

Nubia was invaded by the Mussulman Arabs in 641-642, but Christianity was preserved there for a long time, and even as late as the sixteenth century it is possible to trace some remains of it. The bishops of this country were subject to the monophysite Patriarch of Alexandria. Their number and the number of their Sees are equally unknown, all records having disappeared. There are no native Christians at present remaining in this country.

III

AXOUM AND HIMYAR

In olden days commerce was carried on between the Indian Ocean and the Mediterranean by two natural routes: those of the Euphrates and the Red Sea. By means of the Red Sea, the exchanges were not made directly, for the ships from Egypt did not go to India, neither did the Indian ships sail all the way to Egypt.

The Arabs of Yemen acted as intermediaries between the two countries, and concentrated in Aden the commerce of the Indies and of the east coast of

Africa. From here their merchandise was taken by sea to the Egyptian ports of Berenice, Lenkoslimen, Myos, Ormos, and Klymia (Suez), or by land, starting from the fertile valleys of incense, myrrh, and aloes, to reach Southern Syria, Vlat, Petra, and Gaza. These commercial conditions passed on from the Egyptian kings to those of Persia, and finally to the Lagides and to the Romans. It even helped to determine the frontiers, which remained much the same through all the succeeding changes of government. The Egypt of the Lagides did not extend on the western side of the Red Sea beyond Berenice, in the latitude of Syene.

Two more southern points on the coast, Ptolemaïs, Theron, and Adonlis, temporarily occupied under the Ptolemies, had been abandoned at the time of the Roman conquest, and were afterwards neglected. On the other bank, the Nabathean kingdom, which included the peninsula of Sinai and the whole north-west of the Arabian peninsula, extended no farther north than the port of Leuké-Komé, nearly opposite to Berenice. When this kingdom had been annexed to the empire under Trajan, the frontier on this side remained the same. Between Leuké-Komé and Yemen (the modern Hedjaz), as well as on the opposite side as far north as Abyssinia, the scattered population belonged practically to no one great State. However, even at that time, the people frequented the sanctuary of Kaaba, dedicated to the Semite gods, who were worshipped by the Arabs of the desert.

In Arabia Felix, about the times of Cæsar and Augustus, a political centre was established in the city of Safar. This was known as the kingdom of the Himyarites. It comprised the southern angle of the Arabian peninsula as far as Moka and Aden,

and made its influence felt on the African side up to Zanzibar and beyond. This new power was a cause of anxiety to Augustus, who desired to destroy the position enjoyed by the Arabs as intermediaries between India and Egypt.

The Homerites saw themselves threatened in 730, when C. Aelius Gallus headed an expedition, which was defeated under the walls of Meriaba (the famous Saba of the Bible), and afterwards they were menaced with the destruction of Aden by a Roman fleet. Yet in spite of this and of the growth of the Egyptian navy under the protection of the Roman government, they continued to maintain their political existence, and even their commercial position.

The Abyssinian people owe their civilisation to the Arabs of Yemen, who had emigrated to the opposite coast, or rather to the high tablelands above. They mixed with the natives tribes related to the Egyptians and to the other neighbouring Africans, Gallas, Somalis, and Dunkalis, and imposed upon these their language, to which combination the dialects in use at the present time probably owe their origin. This emigration may well have taken place in 1000 B.C. Only considerably later did an Abyssinian State, with Axoum for its capital, appear—hence the name of the kingdom of the Axoumites. Axoum communicated with the exterior by means of the port of Adoulis, as it does now by that of Massowah.

Towards the end of the first century there were questions involving the Axoumite kingdom. A Greek inscription, copied in 520, gives some information as to its beginnings. Cosmas Indicopleustes copied the inscription, but the name of the sovereign is not to be seen, as the first lines are missing;

however, D. H. Müller identifies it quite satisfactorily with the Zoskales, of whom the author of the *Periple of the Red Sea* speaks as a contemporary. The author lived in the time of Vespasian.

The expeditions of this King of Axoum extended for a considerable distance, both in the direction of the barbarian tribes, who lived near the Gulf of Obock and Cape Guardafui and also in an opposite direction, towards the borders of the Red Sea, as far as Egypt on the west and Leuké-Komé on the east. Therefore he must have been in the Hedjaz; but he had not touched the Sabean kingdom. Later on a different story is told. The kings of Axoum called themselves the kings of the Axoumites and of the Homerites, which supposes that they exercised a certain suzerainty over the princes of Arabia Felix.

The Axoumites and the Homerites professed originally the ancient Sabean religion, a variety of Semitic polytheism. The god Mahrem held a place of special importance with the Axoumites; the gods of the pagan period were all called "Sons of the invincible Mahrem!" In the Greek texts Mahrem is changed into Ares, and the names of Zeus and Poseidon may be seen in the inscription of Adoulis.

The influence of Greece, clearly visible in these transformations and in the language of several of the inscriptions, manifests itself almost as clearly in art, and chiefly in the monuments of Axoum. First among these was a fine temple, containing a sacred enclosure, approached by a long avenue of statues and monoliths.

Owing to favourable circumstances about the commencement of the Christian era, the Jewish propaganda began to do away with Sabean polytheism. After the disasters which fell upon the

nation in the times of Pompey, Vespasian, and Hadrian, certain Israelite colonies, formed by emigration from Palestine, settled in the central region of Arabia, at Teïma, Kaiber, and Gathrib, between the Roman province of Arabia and the Sabean State. To these colonies, then, was probably due the propagation of the Jewish religion among the Homerites. The same means were employed later on by the missionaries of the Gospel. At any rate it is certain that towards the middle of the fourth century, the Jewish religion was professed by a considerable number of Homerites, while the rest of the nation remained attached to the polytheism of its ancestors.

According to Eusebius it would seem that the philosopher Pantæus, master of Clement and Origen, who had before their time directed the catechetical schools of Alexandria, had preached the Gospel to the Indians. They say also that Christians were found among them, who read the Gospel of St. Matthew in Hebrew, as it had been brought to them by St. Bartholomew, their first Apostle.

This Eusebius relates from public rumour; he does not seem to be positively certain of its authenticity. It is, moreover, not easy to determine the exact locality of the India evangelised by Pantæus. It may have been on the western side of India, as St. Jerome thought, or the port of Adoulis, or again the land of the Homerites. It was perhaps the last-named country which Rufinus designated in speaking of "Nearer India," as does also the author of *Passio Bartholomæi* in the collection of the false Abdias. The Byzantine catalogues of the twelve Apostles are more precise. They send Bartholomew to Arabia Felix.

But these later texts, being but arbitrary inter-

pretations of that of Eusebius, do not help in the elucidation of the traditions related by him. The religious history of Abyssinia is enveloped in still greater mystery. Neither Eusebius nor Lucius Charinus possesses any tradition to bring forward on the subject. Ethiopia is not even mentioned. Rufinus alone would have us believe that St. Matthew evangelised this country, and in this opinion he is followed by the false Abdias. Little or no credit should be given, however, to the apostolic accounts of the false Abdias, especially to those of which he is the sole author, such as the *Records of St. Matthew and St. Bartholomew*. It is, moreover, exceedingly difficult to determine precisely which parts of the country the authors meant by "Ethiopia" in those days, whether it was Nubia or the Auxoumite kingdom.

When Rufinus speaks expressly of this kingdom, in commenting on Frumentius, he is silent on the subject of St. Matthew's mission, which would be unaccountable had that mission actually taken place. In a word, if we confine ourselves to traditions justly meriting belief, the religious history of these regions begins no earlier than the fourth century. Rufinus relates a curious story, taken from a good source, in the continuation of the *Church History* of Eusebius. It runs as follows:—

A certain philosopher, Metrodorus by name, made a voyage of discovery in this part of the world; and, following his example, another philosopher, Meropius of Tyre, undertook the same expedition, in company with two children, Frumentius and Ædesius, with whose education he was charged. During the journey a dispute took place, probably at Adoulis, between the natives and the attendants

of Metropus, and the latter were all massacred, the children alone escaping. These were taken to the king, brought up at his court, and treated with great favour. One of them, Frumentius, was eventually made secretary, and the other, Ædesius, chief cup-bearer.

At the king's death, the queen kept the two Tyrians in order that they might complete the education of her son, who was still quite young. They did not fail to profit by their influence in order to encourage the practice of religion among Christian merchants, drawn thither by Roman commerce. About this time also, a few churches were built. When the young prince came of age, they asked and obtained permission to return to their native country.

Ædesius settled at Tyre, became a priest, and himself told his story to Rufinus. Frumentius went to Alexandria, where he met Athanasius and related the narrative to him, begging him to send a bishop into a country of such promise and so well prepared to receive the faith. Athanasius deemed Frumentius the best fitted for this post, consecrated him bishop, and sent him back into Abyssinia, where his labours were crowned with complete success.

The consecration of Frumentius took place under the Emperor Constantius, either shortly before the year 340 or shortly after the year 346, for during the interval between those two years Athanasius was absent from Alexandria. As soon as he had been placed by Constantius among the enemies of the State, the imperial government began to feel anxiety about the Abyssinian mission. An imperial letter was addressed to the Axoumite princes, Aizan and Sazan. They were invited to send back to Alexandria the Bishop Frumentius, "for fear," the

Emperor added, "the errors of Athanasius might have been communicated to him." George, the newly elected Bishop of Alexandria, would be charged with putting him back into the right place. The tone of the imperial letter would lead one to believe that the two princes to whom it was addressed were already Christians. But an inscription of Aizan tells us that they were still pagans. The writer speaks of himself alone as king, but he mentions his two brothers Saiazam and Adepas, the former of whom without a doubt was associated with him before 356.

About the time that Frumentius was preaching the Gospel to the Ethiopians, the land of the Homerites was also receiving the first seeds of Christianity. The Emperor Constantius (337-361) sent thither an embassy conducted by the Bishop Theophilus. Theophilus was an Indian, born in the island of Dibous. He had been sent as a hostage to the court of Constantine (323-337). Being then very young, he received a Christian education, and his training may also be said to have been ascetic. Eusebius of Nicomedia (341) promoted him to the diaconate, and when just about to set out on the embassy he was consecrated bishop. The date is uncertain, but it seems not unlikely that the letter of Constantius to the kings of Axoum may have been sent on this occasion, in which case the journey must have been made about 356, or a little after that date.

The mission with which he was charged had in view to obtain from the king of the Homerites liberty of Christian worship for both Roman merchants and newly converted natives. The envoys, carrying rich presents, were received with due

honour. The king gave orders for the erection at his own expense of three churches, one being at Safar and one at Aden. The site of the third is unknown. Philostorgius says that he inclined to the true faith himself, but it is evident that he was never actually converted. The government in this country appears to have halted between Judaism and the ancient Sabeian worship, but Judaism eventually prevailed, and the local dynasty finally embraced it also, whilst the Christians at Yemen became more and more isolated. The first traces of ecclesiastical organisation appear in the reign of the Emperor Anastasius (491-518).

John Diacrinomenos assures us that the Homerites, who had been Jews from the time of the Queen of Saba, were converted under this prince, and received a bishop, probably Silvanus, bishop of the Homerites, uncle of John Diacrinomenos, who engaged the latter to write his *Church History*. This prelate took up his abode probably in the town of Nedjrân, in the interior, situated considerably to the north of Safar, the capital. Apparently about the same date, in Ethiopia, the Christian religion was becoming the dominant worship of the State by the conversion of the Negus.

This event seems to harmonise with the foundation of the Christian colony at Nedjrân. This, at any rate, is what Malala says: "Damianos, king of the Homerites, in revenge for the bad treatment to which the Jews had been compelled to submit in the Roman Empire, ordered a general massacre of all Byzantine merchants passing through his country. Andan, king of the Axoumites, deeming the consequences of this treatment to be prejudicial to his commercial relations, declared war, defeated

Damianos, killed him, and ravaged his country. This king, who was still a pagan, had made a vow to become a Christian if he were victorious. In order to fulfil his vow, he addressed himself to Justinian, who sent him a bishop, John by name, of the church of St. John at Alexandria."

This story passed from Malala into the *History of John of Asia*, and the *Chronicle of Theophanes*. His account of the campaigns of Elesbaas¹ in Yemen is not drawn from the same source as ours. He probably refers to a much earlier expedition, which was followed by the conversion of the first Christian Negus. But it is nevertheless strange that Malala should have misplaced this event so far as to place it during the reign of Justinian. However, be this as it may, the conversion of the Axoumite king must have taken place towards the end of the fifth century. The *Senkessar Chronicles*, and *Lives of the Ethiopian Saints* are unanimous in placing the coming of the nine holy Egyptian monks in the reign of Ela Amida.

The history of Dhû-Nowas, from whatever source it may be drawn, supposes that at a certain time, before the years 520–523, Ethiopian intervention had taken place in the affairs of Himyar, that the power had been removed from the ancient dynasty and placed by the Axoumites in the hands of another princely family. But at what date precisely, or even approximately, the conversion of Abyssinia took place is no easy matter to determine. One can hardly accept seriously the assertion that the nine Saints received their habit from the hands of St. Pachomius (349).

Another story, of legendary origin no doubt, but

¹ Kaleb.

not improbable, and fairly reconcilable with existing facts, is that the King Kaleb, before his departure for his transmarine expedition in 524, went to consult a hermit who had lived for forty-five years in seclusion; and hagiographic tradition seems to identify this recluse with St. Pantaleon, one of the nine monks. This would carry back the arrival of the monks to a date before the year 480. Axoumite inscriptions neither help on nor hinder the solution of this question, except inasmuch as all of them, whether they are in Gheez, Sabeian, or Greek, presuppose official paganism. Müller has recently established this fact, basing his principles on the epigraphic account of Bent's travels.

The Christian establishment of Nedjrân was not the only one to be met with in Himyar. At Safar there was also a church, and there it was that the Abyssinian viceroy lived, under the protection of an Ethiopian garrison. At the time of which we are speaking, and in all these countries, the propagation of Christianity went hand in hand with the Roman alliance. It was certainly favoured by the representatives of the Negus. It is, therefore, natural that it should have had against it, besides the attachment to Sabeian and Jewish religions, the sentiment of national independence, and of sympathy with the enemy of Rome and Ethiopia—the Persian Empire.

A prince of the ancient royal family, driven out by Abyssinian administration, took advantage of a favourable opportunity to hoist the flag of Homerite independence. This was Dhu-Nowas. Like the kings, his ancestors, he professed the Jewish religion. The viceroy of Ethiopia having died at the beginning of the winter, and the rigour of the season rendering communication with the

Abyssinian coast somewhat difficult, he managed to seize Safar, massacred the garrison and the clergy, and changed the church into a synagogue.

On hearing this, as may well be imagined, the Negus thought at once of suppressing the revolt. Cosmas Indicopleustes was at Adoulis in the beginning of Justin's reign, and witnessed the preparations made by the King of Axoum to enforce his despised authority. It is not possible to ascertain how long these preparations were in progress, nor the exact date at which the Homerite insurrection took place. This must have been considered by all the Christians of the country as menacing their safety. At Safar, Dhû-Nowas had exterminated a Christian colony representing the Axoumite occupation. In several other places, and notably in Nedjrân, there were some Christians of different origin. A distinction might have been made between their cause and that of the Ethiopian mission. It seems, as a matter of fact, that there must have been an interval of uncertainty when the Christians of Nedjrân had to suffer ill-treatment from the hands of their infidel compatriots without being threatened directly by the new king. It was probably to this time that James, Bishop of Saroug in Osrhoene, refers in the letter in which he pities them for having so much to endure from the Jews, and consoles them as best he can with theological considerations.

But soon the situation became more serious. In 523 Dhû-Nowas laid siege to Nedjrân. Foreseeing a descent of the Axoumites, he had to avoid leaving behind him a sufficiently large colony of Christians, who would not fail to join the Negus in military operations. The siege dragged on in-

definitely, and in order to make an end of it, the Homerite prince had recourse to stratagem. He proposed capitulation, which was accepted; then, being master of the town, he violated his promise, and had all the Christians who refused to apostatise massacred. Among his victims must be named the chief of the tribe of the Harith-ibn-Kaab. This Emir and his people, to the number of three hundred and forty, had shut themselves up in the town; they had given the Nedjrânites energetic counsels, which had not been accepted, so that those brave nomads suffered the humiliation of being butchered without having an opportunity of drawing their swords. We also hear of two women, one named Daumé, wife of the prince of the Nedjrânites, who was decapitated with her two daughters. They even had the barbarity to make her assist at her children's deaths, and to pour their blood into her mouth. The other was the mother of a little child of three, whom Dhû-Nowas had saved, as he spared all under the age of reason. In vain did he try to caress him, the little fellow did nothing but revile him. His mother when dying commended him to our Lord Jesus Christ. When he grew up, he was sent on an embassy to Constantinople, where John of Asia recognised him. He was called Baisar; but though every one thought him to be the child grown to manhood, he would not own to the fact. The executions naturally began with the clergy, and Paul, the bishop, who had been dead for two years, was disinterred, and his corpse thrown into the flames. Into an enormous burning ditch, they threw priests, monks, and "consecrated virgins," or nuns, to the number of four hundred and twenty-seven persons; then followed the burning of the

church, and lastly a fiendish massacre of four thousand Christian persons. No sooner were these atrocities committed than Dhû-Nowas hastened to communicate to his friends, Kawad, the King of Persia, and the Emir of Hira, Al-Moundhir, the capture of Nedjrân.

His envoys met Al-Moundhir at ten days' journey south-east of Hira. This brought them to the environs of Houfhouf (El-Hassa), not very far from the maritime regions by which the Nedjed borders the Persian Gulf. The Emir was somewhat near the theatre of these horrible events. At the same time the envoys of the Emperor Justin came to him, in company with the priest Abramos, son of Euphrasios, and Bishop Sergius of Rosapha, with several other ecclesiastics and laymen, among whom was Simeon, Bishop of Beth-Arsam, head of the Monophysites in the Persian Empire. It was owing to this circumstance that the horrors committed at Nedjrân were known almost immediately in the Roman Empire.

The embassy of Dhû-Nowas arrived at the camp of Al-Moundhir on 20th January 524. This very year, or the year following, John the Psalmist, in a Greek hymn, commemorated the town of Nedjrân and its martyrs, with Hareth their leader. John was Abbot of Beth-Aphthonios, a monastery in the neighbourhood of Chalcis. The letter of James of Saroug shows that the situation of Nedjrân and of its Christian colony awoke interest in the Syro-Euphrasian world. Besides which John Psaltes must have derived his information from a letter which Simeon of Beth-Arsam wrote on arriving at Hira, and addressed to his namesake, Simeon Abbot of Gabula, a Syrian town near Chalcis.

The Bishop of Beth-Arsam wished the account of these events to be given to the Patriarch of Alexandria, so that the latter might persuade the King of Abyssinia to interfere; also that notice thereof should be given to the Bishops of Antioch, Tharsis, Cæsarea of Cappadocia, and Edessa, recommending them to pray for the survivors and to make a commemoration of the martyrs. He likewise desired them to make sure of the Elders of the Jewish community at Tiberias, and that they should take it upon themselves to make these Elders responsible for the persecutions endured by the Homerite Christians.

Simeon's document is not the only one we possess concerning these events. An anonymous author, who was probably Sergius, Bishop of Rosapha, one of Justin's ambassadors to Al-Moundhir, gives a clearer account in the form used in the times of the martyrs. This document as handed down to us is in Greek; it is the *Martyrium Arethæ* published by Boissonade and the Bollandists. Instead of the ending of Simeon's account, we find actually first an account of the steps taken by the Emperor Justin and the Patriarch of Alexandria towards Elesbaas, King of Ethiopia, and even the letter of the emperor to the Negus is reproduced—according to the imagination of the hagiographer, no doubt. Then comes the history of the expedition of Elesbaas, with precise details and of evident authenticity. Finally, the last chapter contains an account of the reparation exacted by Elesbaas, of the investiture which the viceroy Abramos received at his hands, and, last of all, of the edifying death of the pious Negus. The Armenian translation, made

from the Syriac text of the *Martyrium*, is without this triple appendix, and it is highly probable that we have here earlier additions coming from equally reliable sources.

The *Martyrium* and Simeon's letter both savour of monophysite opinions, which is not astonishing when we consider that Simeon of Beth-Arsam was an ardent Monophysite, and that the Bishop of Rosapha could hardly be expected to entertain other religious views. Putting this aside, one notices also that in the two documents many things are dramatically related. For instance, in one place Simeon gives his account the form of a letter, written as it were by Al-Moundhir to Dhû Nowas. He owns, it is true, that he has greatly lengthened the text of the letter, from the oral reports brought by the envoys. Other details were furnished by messengers sent expressly from Hira to Nedjrân.

The whole account, taking it as it stands, must be true, but the atrocities committed in this region are no worse than others committed in this same oriental world at the present day, as every one knows. They, however, left an indelible impression on local tradition. Even Mohammed, in the Koran, makes mention of the ditch of fire into which the martyrs had been thrown, and he condemns the persecutors to the everlasting flames of hell. In the eighth century Ibn-Ishag speaks of the victims as numbering 20,000. Retribution soon began to overtake the persecutors. The details of Elesbaas' expedition may be read in the *Martyrium*, and Procopius also relates that: "Ellesthæos, king of the Ethiopians, a fervent Christian, having heard that the Homerites on the other side of the sea, who were partly Jews, partly

attached to their ancient religion, were oppressing beyond measure the Christians of this country, collected an army and a fleet with which he marched against them. Having conquered and killed their king, he substituted in his place another, a Homerite also, but a Christian, called Esimphæos." Shortly after this the Homerites revolted against Esimphæos; they were headed by Abramos, an Abyssinian Christian, a former slave of a Roman lawyer of Adoulis. Ellesthæos, who had returned to his own country, on hearing of this, sent an army commanded by one of his own relations to aid Esimphæos; but this Abyssinian prince was betrayed and killed on the way by his own soldiers, who passed over to Abramos. A second army, sent to avenge him, was cut to pieces, and only after the death of Ellesthæos did Abramos consent to recognise the suzerainty of the Ethiopians. The Byzantine Empire endeavoured to profit by the new state of affairs. Several ambassadors (among whom first Julian, then Nonnosus) were sent to the Kings of Akoum and Himyar. The empire would have liked to direct the trade in silk to this region, which trade had hitherto always been carried to Persia, probably by way of Ormuz.

There were also certain military projects in the air. Justinian had fixed upon a certain Caïs, who had quarrelled with Esimphæos, intending to make him phylarch of the Arabs of Kinda and Nedjed. Once installed in this office Caïs was to make friends with the Homerites, with a view to attacking the Persians. All this was without much result. Oman was too far for the Homerites; silk still continued to reach the Romans by means of the Persian trade. Caïs was certainly installed in Nedjed; he left it to be-

come Phylarch of Palestine. As for the expeditions against the Persians, they did not go further than a thrust at Mecca, during the time and under the leadership of Abramos, who, no doubt, was helped by the people of Kinda and Maad.

With the exception of an allusion of Procopius, this expedition is known only in the Arabian legends of the eighth and ninth centuries. They relate that Abraha, having had a magnificent church built at Sana, desired to draw thither the pilgrims of all Arabia, whereupon a Koreischite, offended by this apparent attempt to outdo the Kaaba, set off to profane the church of Sana. Then Abraha declared war against Mecca, but no armed resistance was made against him; the divinity "defended his sanctuary by prodigies and scourges, which obliged the Abyssinian king to return to his country."

Abraha was succeeded on the Homerite throne by his two sons, Yaksoum and Massong, but the "black" Abyssinians oppressed their subjects too much, and this led to an expedition from Persia about the year 570, which put an end to the Ethiopian dynasty. In its place a national king, called Saïf, was elected, depending on the Sassanide Empire. Some time after, this Saïf perished a victim to an Abyssinian reaction. Then Chosroes I. sent his general, Wahriz, who had all the Abyssinians massacred, and remained himself in the country as governor.

These Persian interferences were regarded at Constantinople as detrimental to the interests of the empire, and were brought forward among the motives for the rupture which took place between the two great States in the reign of Justin II. This change was clearly most unfavourable to Christianity. Perhaps the church of Sana was

maintained, but the Persian governors could not interest themselves in the worship of which it was the centre. The Christian population of Nedjrân survived, and it even resisted the progress of the Mussulman religion sixty years later. Mohammed speaks of a bishop of this Church, Koss-ihn-Saïda by name, whom he had heard preach; he was renowned for his eloquence and talent as a politician.

But the Mussulmans did not allow this Christian centre to exist much longer. The Caliph Omar banished from the country all the Christians who would not apostatise and embrace Islam. This exodus from the country led them towards the lower Euphrates, in the neighbourhood of Konfa, where, towards the end of the eighth century, the Catholicos, Timothy, gave them a bishop. In the letter in which Timothy speaks of this event the Nedjrânites are represented as having until then held the impious doctrines of Julian Halicarnassus, which meant, in other words, that they were Monophysites of the deepest dye.

The history of Arethas, Elesbaas, and Abraha, has been written more than once by Byzantine hagiographers. It has already been said that in one of the appendices at the end of the *Martyrium*, Elesbaas is reported to have himself invested Abraha before returning to his kingdom. John of Asia notes the same fact. This is decidedly untrue. But to this fact is attached another document, which we do not possess in its integrity, viz., the Life of St. Gregentios, Archbishop of Safar. The feast of this Saint is kept on December 19th. According to some Greek authors he was the founder of a town, sometimes called Milan, sometimes "*Lopliana in finibus Avaricæ et Asiæ.*" Here one recognises Lipljan,

the ancient Ulpiana in Dardania. But that matters little. The parents of Gregentios were Agapios and Theotecna. He went to Egypt, became a hermit, and after some time was sent to direct the Church of the Homerites. The first part of his life, as summarised by the compilers, has neither been published nor signalised in any way. As for the remaining part it may be thus divided: 1, The account of the miraculous election of Abramos; 2, The legislation of Abramos regarding his subjects; 3, A long dispute between Gregentios and the Jewish Doctor Erban. At the end of this dispute, which included no fewer than five discussions, all the Jews were converted. The king and the archbishop live holy and happy lives. Abramos reigns thirty years, and is succeeded by his son Serdidos. Gregentios follows him shortly to his eternal reward. The dispute with this satisfactory termination was long known and even published by Boissonade from a manuscript of Coistin. Other manuscripts on the subject exist, but the beginning of the history has not yet been extracted from them. The legislation was evidently ideal, of a monachal kind; faults against morality occupy the writer to a great extent, and the penalties imposed for these faults are of a most extraordinary description. It is evident that all takes place at Salente.

We are also treated to relations of events of a marvellous character. At the moment of the election Abramos rises in the air by the power of the Lord, and is borne into the presence of Elesbaas. When the legislation has been promulgated, the copies of the code laid on the altar go by themselves into the hands of those destined to receive them. Christ appears at the end of the dispute

like a *deus ex machinâ* to confound the incredulity of the Jews. One is inclined to doubt not only these "facts," but even the very existence of St. Gregentios!

IV

THE ARABS

Arabia is bounded on the north by the Syrian provinces of the Roman Empire, and by the equally Syrian or Aramean regions of the Persian Empire. In their unceasing migrations towards the north the Arabian tribes, constantly met with Aramean populations speaking Syriac, or some dialect nearly connected with it. The line of contact rarely coincided with the political frontier. From the first century even, Central Mesopotamia was filled with Arabs. Though nomadic as a rule in their habits, they had one stable establishment in the fortress of Hatra, a few miles to the south of Nineveh, on the right bank of the Tigris.

The Euphrates, at least from the Roman frontier at Abon Serai, flowed entirely through Arabian territory. The chiefs of those tribes owed allegiance to the King of Persia. Those of Hatra enjoyed under the Parthian dynasty full autonomy, which the Sassanides did not respect. One of the first kings of this family, Ardaschir, or Sapor I., took the fortress which had defied all the efforts of Trajan and Severus, and put an end to this vassal State. Another was soon formed, of which the centre was at Hira, south of ancient Babylon, and not far from Mesched-Ali, one of the holy towns of the Chiïtes on the borders of the great stony desert. This place became the seat of a dynasty of Arabian

princes, vassals of the Sassanide Empire, who reduced to subjection all the scattered tribes of Mesopotamia on the banks of the Euphrates and the Persian Gulf as far as the Bahrein Isles. In the seventh century Hira was replaced by Konfa, founded near it by the first caliphs.

On the Roman frontier the ethnical situation was much the same, but the political conditions were very different. The ancient Nabathean kingdom, annexed in 105, included many deserts, the Sinaitic peninsula, the coast beyond the Gulf of Akubar as far as Lenké-Komé, and, nominally at least, the interior between Medina and Damas. Also, farther back, Damas, Palmyra, and Circesium to the borders of Aleppo, an immense region where nomadic tribes alone could subsist. There they wandered at will, but on approaching the cultivated country they were confronted by a line of fortresses which stopped their advance. These tribes had little but commercial intercourse with the Romans, and no political tie united them among themselves. So that one cannot speak, during the period of the predominance of the Western Empire, of any Arabian vassals of the Romans. There is nothing here to compare with the establishment of Hatra in the Parthian kingdom.

The Romans, however, came, though somewhat late, *i.e.* in the time of Justinian. In 531, an Arabo-Roman State was created, to counterbalance to some extent the Arabo-Persian State of the Kings of Hira.

As a consequence of a tolerance imposed by circumstances, we find that from the third century some isolated tribes had established themselves within the boundary line, notably in the regions of

Bostra and Damascus. These tribes were led by their own sheiks, invested by the Roman government somewhat in the same way as were the Moorish princes in African Barbary. Administratively they were called "Phylarchs." Little by little these Arabian organisations multiplied; they were given a military government, and grouped into provinces. There were phylarchs even of Palestine and Arabia, and this means of defence was recognised as so important and necessary, that a general phylarch was elected, he being the chief of the tribe of the Ghassanides. This person was a kind of vassal king, who exercised authority over the Arabs of all the oriental provinces of ancient Syria as far as the desert. On one side he resisted the subjects of Hira, and on the other he opened the Roman frontier to emigration from the south, and thus paved the way for the Mussulman invasion. But the Ghassanide Emir had theoretically no authority over the subjects of the empire. Municipal organisations and provincial law courts continued to exist; in fact it is clear that the military chief was master. This was manifest even in religious matters.

These Syrian Arabs had been Christians for some time, and even had in certain places bishops of their own. The history of the origin of these Saracen Churches is, as far as we know, as follows: Rufinus tells the story of a queen of the Saracens, Maouria by name, who had long fought against the Romans, and agreed to make peace on condition that they would give as bishop to her tribe a certain monk of the neighbouring desert, named Moses, greatly renowned for his sanctity and miracles. The Emperor Valens, who favoured the Arians and persecuted the orthodox, was then reigning. Valens consented to

grant the request of Maouria, and the monk Moses was taken to Alexandria to be consecrated by the Arian bishop, Lucius. Moses, however, belonging to the orthodox faith, refused to be consecrated by a heretic, and held his ground so firmly that they were obliged to seek some Catholic bishop in exile to impose hands upon him. This event took place about 374. About the fourth century the conversion of the Sheik Locoum took place, as related in the history of Sozomen. This sheik, being in great distress at having no children, had recourse to a hermit, who prayed for him and promised him posterity on condition that he became a Christian.

On the promise being fulfilled, Locoum and all his tribe asked for the waters of baptism. In these anecdotes the great veneration which the children of the desert had for anchorites whose sanctity shone forth from their wild solitudes may be perceived. St. Hilarion also, the great monk of Gaza, whose life was prolonged till 371, appears to have impressed them very deeply. In the next century, according to Theodoret, who was an eye-witness, St. Simon Stylites exercised great influence over the Syrian Arabs of the north and of Mesopotamia. Little by little, thanks to the marvellous influence of these saintly hermits, all the nomadic tribes living in the interior of the Roman province were converted to Christianity. The tribes of the exterior when they crossed the frontier were not slow to fall under the same influence.

Cyril of Scythopolis (sixth century) in his *Life of St. Euthymius*, a hermit of Pharan, between Jericho and Jerusalem, gives an account of the conversion of a tribe which, about the year 420, was changing its quarters near the Euphrates to go to live in Palestine.

The sheik was called Aspebætos; his son Terebon, still a child, was paralyzed, and in this condition Aspebætos presented him to the hermits of Pharan. Euthymius cured him miraculously, and after the miracle the entire tribe embraced Christianity. Their own chief, Aspebætos, consecrated bishop by Juvenal of Jerusalem, was sent back to feed them as his flock, having taken the name of Peter in baptism.

These stories enable us to trace the foundation of two episcopal Sees. The first, that of Moses, seems to be identical with the bishopric of Pharan, which for some time existed in the valleys of Mount Sinai and ended by becoming attached to the celebrated Convent of St. Catherine. As for the one which had as its first bishop the sheik converted by St. Euthymius, it bore the name of Parembolæ. Its bishop, the former sheik, assisted personally at the Council of Ephesus, 431.

A bishop of the same title, called Valens, is mentioned in 518 among the suffragans of the patriarchal See of Jerusalem. Therefore the Saracens converted by St. Euthymius had their tents, not in the provinces of Arabia, but in that of Palestine. A third establishment of this description is met with farther north in the province of Phœnicia II., or Damascus. One titular bishop, named Eustasius, who assisted at the Council of Chalcedon, and who was still governing his diocese in 453, is known. He gives himself the title of "Bishop of the nation of the Saracens." At the same time as the above-named bishop there lived at Chalcedon another Saracen bishop, named John, who bore exactly the same title as Eustasius. He was possibly a bishop of Parembolæ. We find, at the Council of Ephesus in 449, one Auxilaos, bishop

of the allied Saracens. It is hard to determine to which of the two Sees he must have belonged.

The bishop of the Isle of Iotabé must also be mentioned. This islet, now called Tiran, situated at the entrance of the Gulf of Akabah, was an important centre of commercial transactions and the receipt of customs. An Arab, called Amorkesos, quitting the country subject to the King of Persia, established himself here in 470. In 473, he sent Peter, a bishop of his nation, to the Emperor Leo, in order to obtain for him the position of phylarch of the Saracens of Arabia-Petræa. Leo sent for the Emir, loaded him with honours, and conferred upon him authority, not only over Iotabé, but also over several other places. In 498 the island was taken back by Romanus, general of the Emperor Anastasius. But the bishopric remained. We hear of a certain bishop of Iotabé called Anastasius, who assisted at the Council of Jerusalem in 536. Perhaps this See was nothing but a passing continuation of that of Pharan or Sinai. These foundations remained isolated for the Saracen bishoprics and were never grouped into a national Church. On the contrary, they entered into the provincial system of the Greek Church, and were subject to the Metropolitans of Petra, Jerusalem, and Damascus. The constitution of the Ghassanide State the foundation on this frontier of an Arabian kingdom as a vassal of Rome, took place too late to interfere with the canons of the Church in this country.

It had, however, its influence on religious affairs. The Monophysites, repressed with a firm hand by the successors of Justinian, found in the Emir Al Moundhir an energetic protector.

There lived on the central plain of Arabia (Ned-

jed), on the banks of the Persian Gulf, the tribes of Kinda and of Maad. From the times of the Emperor Anastasius, they had relations with the Romans. At that time their chief was the Emir Hareth, to whom Anastasius sent a certain Euphrasios, charging him to bring about friendly intercourse with the empire. Hareth's son, Caïs, was in communication with Justinian, through the son of Euphrasios, named Abramos, and his grandson Nonnosos. Abramos obtained from him, as hostage, his own son Mavia, whom he sent to Constantinople.

Nonnosos was deputed to bring Caïs himself, the emperor having designs upon him, which, however, were not successful. Success was reserved for Abramos, who for the second time made the journey to Nedjed. In the interval Caïs became involved in difficulties with the Homerite King Esimphæos, through a blood feud, and was driven out of the country. He accepted Abramos's offer, confided his tribe to the care of his sons, Amr and Yezed, set out for Constantinople, and received the governorship of Palestine, where several of his relations followed him.

This Caïs, a Christian, is identified with the Arabian poet Imrulcaïs, the author of one of the seven poems famous among the Arabians under the name of "Moaltakas." But it was only by the means of these Byzantine connections that Christianity penetrated into Central Arabia. The Persian Church had at least four bishoprics on the borders of the Persian Gulf, at Katar, Honfhonf, Pasa-Ardachir, and in the Isle of Darin.

They are heard of about the end of the sixth century in the Council of the Catholicos of Seleucia. And again a hundred years later they showed signs of life, which proves that they resisted the assaults

of the Moslem propaganda for a considerable time. Now, however, all trace of Christianity has disappeared in these countries, where the Turks themselves are regarded as "infidels" by the natives, the fanatical Wahabis. The Arabian bishoprics on the Persian Gulf must have disappeared towards the end of the ninth century, as they are not mentioned in the list drawn up by Elias of Damascus. At Hira, the capital of Persian Arabia, there were also Christians, split up, it is true, into separate schisms each under its own bishop. The date of the first Church is uncertain, but, from the beginning, it owed allegiance to the Catholicos of Seleucia, chief of the regular hierarchy in the Persian Empire.

When the Jacobite schism began in 543, by the clandestine ordination of James Baradaï, the religious needs of the Monophysites of Persian Mesopotamia were, at the same time, attended to, and they were provided with a Maphrain, or Anticatholicos. To this illegal jurisdiction the bishopric of the Arabs was eventually attached. It appears, under various titles, in Jacobite documents. The letter quoted above, of Simon of Beth-Arsam, shows that from the time of Justin I. these religious conflicts had been raging round the Prince of Hira. This potentate left his Christian subjects in peace, but continued himself to adore the ancient Semitic divinities, in particular the goddess Ouzza, the Arabian Venus, to whom they sometimes offered human sacrifices. To her it was that Moundi-ribn-Amraalquaïs, the same who treated with Dhu-Nowas and Simon Beth-Arsam, immolated 400 Christian virgins. But having taken prisoner the son of his rival, Hareth the Ghassanide, he sacrificed him also.

This same terrible prince Moundhir had a Christian wife, who came from the family of the Ghassanides; her name was Hind, and she was sister of the young prince immolated to Ouzza. This princess had founded a monastery at Hira, the inscription of which has been preserved by the scientific author Yakout. It runs thus: "This Church was built by Hind, daughter of Kings and mother of the King Amr-ibn-Moundhir, the servant of Christ, mother of His servant and daughter of His servants, under the reign of the King of Kings, Chosroes Anouscharwân, in the time of the Bishop Mai Ephraim. May the God for whom she has built this monastery pardon her her sins, may He have pity on her and on her son, may He receive her and make her reside in His abode of peace and truth, and may God be with her and with her son, for ever and ever."

This inscription was engraved in the reign of Amr, son of Moundhir (554-569); it leads us to suppose this prince to have been a Christian. But the Gospel was spread and disseminated with difficulty in this imperious and sanguinary family. After Amr it relapsed into paganism if not under his brother Kabous, at least in the reign of Moundhir-ibn-Moundhir, also a brother and the successor of Kabous.

After Moundhir came Naaman, who at first worshipped idols and offered human sacrifices, but was converted about 594. The Confession of Faith adopted by the Emirs of Hira was the Nestorian. The Catholicos Jesuyab I., died at Hira in 594 or 595, and was buried in Hind's monastery. Naaman is the last of his family who reigned at Hira. One of his sons, Moundhir-ibn-Naaman, is heard

of in the beginning of Islamism at the head of the Christian Arabs of Bahrein who refused to acknowledge Mahomet. He died in 533, fighting against the Mussulmans.

As to the double bishopric of Hira it continued to exist, and is mentioned in the archives of both the rival Churches. The foundations we have studied in this memoir have generally either ended in becoming national Churches or episcopal Sees attached to ecclesiastical provinces of the Roman or the Persian Empire. The national Churches of Nubia, Abyssinia, and the Homerites blended their self-government with a certain amount of dependence on the Patriarch of Alexandria, the Monophysite Patriarch of course, for none of these Churches date from the time when the Alexandrian patriarchate was Catholic and undivided.

And of all this widespread Christianity in the country of the Arabs and the Chamite people, what is now left? One single Church, that of Abyssinia, which, like the Abyssinian State itself, has been maintained through many and great vicissitudes, and still keeps its singular autonomy, its Monophysite confession of faith, and its Alexandrian allegiance.

INDEX

- AARON (M.), 8
 Abraha, 207
 Abramos, 203 *ff.*, 209
 Acacius, 27 *f.*, 113
 Aetius, 46
 Agapitus, Pope, 135, 160 *ff.*, 177
 Aidan, 7
 Alban (M.), 8
 Alexandria, 19 *f.*, 27, 32, 34, 100 *f.*
 Aloa (the ancient Meroe), 188
 Anastasius, Emperor, 28 *f.*, 215
 Ancyra, Council of, 114
 Anicetus, Pope, 95
 Anomians, 21
 Anthimius, 40 *ff.*
 Antioch, 20
 Apollinarius, 22 *f.*, 46, 120
 Apostles' Creed, 51, 90
Apostolical Constitutions, 88
 Arabia, 191 *f.*
 Araminians, 19
 Arethas, 32 *f.*
 Aristides, 173
 Arius, Arians, 21, 46, 105
 Armenia, Armenians, 13 *ff.*, 18, 36 *f.*
 Athanasius, 39, 99, 116, 134, 196
 Augustine, 57 *f.*

 BÆTICA, 181
 Balsamon, 133
 Baptism, 60 *f.*
 Baronius, 145
 Barsumas, 37 *f.*
 Basil, 120, 125
 Basilian monks, 44
 Bede, 1, 5
 Boissonade, 204, 209
 Boniface I., Pope, 106
 Boniface II., Pope, 162
 Byzantium, *see* Constantinople

 CAIS, 206, 216
 Callistus, Pope, 99
Canons of the Apostles, 88
 Canterbury, 7
 Celestine, Pope, 8, 106
 Celtic Christianity, 4 *ff.*
 Cerinthus, 22
 Chad, 6
 Chalcedon, Council of, 24 *ff.*, 39, 47, 112 *f.*, 129 *f.*
 Chaldeans, 17
 Chalice for laity, 68
 Chosroes I., 207
 CHRIST, 21 *ff.*
 Chrysostom, 135
 Clement of Rome, 84 *ff.*
 Colman, 7
 Constantine, Pope, 142
 Constantinople, 20 *f.*, 68, 118, 133
 Constantinople, I. Council of (2nd General), 46, 50, 118 *f.*
 Constantinople, II. Council of (5th General), 47
 Constantinople, III. Council of (6th General), 47 *f.*
 Constantinople, *Quini Sextum* Council, 140 *f.*
 Constantinopolitan Creed, 53, 132
 Copts, Coptic, 20, 35, 87
 Cosmas Indicopleustes, 192, 201
 Ctesiphon, 16
 Cuthbert, 7
 Cyprian, 97 *f.*
 Cyril of Alexandria, 23 *ff.*
 Cyril of Scythopolis, 213

 DAMASCUS, 211 *ff.*
 Damasus, Pope, 105 *f.*, 119 *ff.*, 124
 Demetrius of Alexandria, 100
 Denis, *see* Dionysius

Diodorus of Tarsus, 22
 Dionysius of Alexandria, 90, 100*f.*, 114
 Dionysius of Corinth, 85, 102
 Dionysius, Pope, 100
 Dioscorus, 24, 47, 129
 Docetism, 22
 Donatists, 105
 Dorotheus, 173, 176
 Duchesne, 11

ECCLESIASTICAL CANONS, 88
 Edessa, 14*f.*, 37, 104
 Eleutherius, Pope, 10, 93
 England, 1*ff.*
 Ephesus, Council of, 46, 135, 214
 Erzerum, 19
 Etchmiadzin, 19
 Ethiopia, 13*f.*, 19, 36, 183
 Eudoxius, 46
 Eunomius, 46
 Eusebius of Cæsarea, 95*f.*, 105*f.*, 116, 194*f.*
 Eusebius of Doryleum, 135
 Eusebius of Nicomedia, 46, 115, 120, 197
 Eusebius of Samos, 120*f.*
 Euthymius, 213*f.*
 Eutyches, Eutychians, 24, 36, 47

FABIAN, Pope, 100
 Felix III., Pope, 28, 170
Filioque, 50*ff.*
 Finian, 7
 Firmilian, 98, 102
 Friedrich, 163, 166
 Frumentius, 196

GELASIUS, Pope, 30, 171
 Germanus of Auxerre, 8
 Getuli, 181
 Gildas, 5
 Gnostics, 22
 Greek Church, differences from Roman, 42*f.*, 50, 59*ff.*, 141
 Gregentios, 208*f.*
 Gregory I., Pope, 1, 61, 112, 124, 156*ff.*

Gregory II., Pope, 2
 Gregory III., Pope, 2
 Gregory, the Illuminator, 18
 Gregory Nazianzen, 57, 125*f.*
 Gregory Thaumaturgus, 123

HALICARNASSUS, JULIAN, 208
 Henotikon, 27*f.*
 Hermas, 22, 86
 Hilarion, 213
 Hippolytus, 87
 Honorius, Pope, 48, 155
 Hormisdas, Pope, 172*f.*, 175*f.*

IBAS, 22, 25, 31, 37
 Ignatius, 85
 Image-worship, 143, 145, 147
 Immaculate Conception, 73*f.*
 Indulgences, 72*f.*
 Innocent, Pope, 135
 Iotabe, 215
 Irenæus of Lyons, 10, 79, 96
 Irenæus of Sirmium, 5
 Isis, Temple of, 184*f.*, 189

JACOBITES, 21, *see also* James Baradaïus
 James Barodaius, 33*ff.*, 217
 Jerusalem, 20
 Jews in Arabia, 194, 200
 John VII., Pope, 142
 John IX., Pope, 146
 John XI., Pope, 149
 John Diacrimenos, 198
 John of Ephesus, 187, 199, 208
 Joseph of Arimathea, 10
 Julian of Caerleon, 8
 Julius, Pope, 117, 120, 122
 Justin, Emperor, 29
 Justinian, 29*ff.*, 39, 158*ff.*, 185

KUSH, 183

LEO I., Pope, 8, 27*f.*, 31, 47, 129
 Leo XIII., 40
 Leo the Isaurian, 143
 Liberius, Pope, 49, 120
 Lichfield, 6

- Lindisfarne, 7
 Lucifer of Antioch, 120
 Lucius Charinus, 195
 Lucius, King, 10

 MACEDONIUS, 46
 Malabar, 16, 18
 Marcellus of Ancyra, 52, 99, 120
 Marcion, Emperor, 25, 39
 Martin I., Pope, 155
 Mauritania, Moors, 181 *f.*
 Melchites, 35, 44
 Meroe, 184
 Metrophanes, 133
 Michael Cerularius, 77, 150 *ff.*
 Mohammed, 38, 205, 208
 Mommsen, 166, 179
 Monophysites, 18, 20 *ff.*, 185 *f.*, 215
 Monothelites, 48, 132
 Montanists, 93 *f.*
 Müller, 193, 200

 NAPATA, 184
 Nennius, 5
 Nestorius, Nestorians, 17, 22 *ff.*, 36
 ff., 46
 Nicæa, I. Council of, 46, 96
 Nicæa, II. Council of (7th General),
 48
 Nicene Creed, 52 *f.*, 117
 Nicholas, Pope, 146
 Nisibis, 37 *f.*
 Nonnosus, 206, 216
 Novatians, 21
 Nubia, 183

 ORIGEN, 91, 100
 Osius, 117

 PACHOMIUS, 199
 Palladius, 8
 Palmyra, 211
 Pantænus, 194
 Pantaleon, 200
 Paschal controversy, 94
 Patrick, 8
 Patripassians, 99
 Paul of Samosata, 22, 104 *f.*

 Paulinists, 21
 Paulinus, 7
 Pelagius II., Pope, 60 *f.*, 158
 Pelagius, 26
 Persia, or Parthia, 13 *ff.*, 36, 38
 Peter at Rome, 82 *f.*
 Peter of Alexandria, 105, 121
 Peter of Antioch, 76
 Peter the Fuller, 29, 132
 Phanar, Greek quarter at Constanti-
 nople, 44
 Pharan, 213
 Philæ, 184, 189
Philosophumena, 99
 Philostorgius, 198
 Photius, 55, 123, 145 *ff.*
 Polycarp, 91, 95
 Polycrates of Ephesus, 95
 Proclus, 170
 Procopius, 205
 Psammetichus, 183
 Purgatory, 70 *f.*

 QUINI-SEXTUM, 140 *f.*

 RE-BAPTISM, 97
 Révillout, 189
 Rimini, Council of, 8
 Rome, Church of, 79 *ff.*
 Rufinus, 195 *f.*, 212

 SABELLIUS, 99
 Sahara, 180
 Sapor I., 210
 Sapor II., 15
 Sardica, Council of, 110, 115 *ff.*,
 136 *f.*
 Sassanide dynasty, 210 *f.*
 Seleucia, 16
 Seleucia, Council of, 118, 216
 Sergius I., Pope, 142
 Sergius III., Pope, 148
 Sergius, Patriarch, 48
 Simon Stylites, 213
 Siricius, Pope, 136
 Sixtus II., Pope, 98
 Soter, Pope, 95, 102
 Sozomen, 213

Stachys, 133
 Stephen, Pope, 97 *f.*, 102 *f.*
 Sylvester, Pope, 9
 Symmachus, Pope, 171

TERTULLIAN, 91
 Theodore of Canterbury, 6
 Theodore of Mopsuestia, 22, 24 *ff.*,
 31, 37
 Theodoret, 25, 31, 37, 213
 Theodosiopolis, 19
 Theodotus, 92
 Thessalonica, 170 *ff.*
 Tyre, Council of, 116

UNLEAVENED BREAD, 64 *ff.*

VICTOR, Pope, 95 *ff.*, 104
 Vigilius, Pope, 47, 123, 161 *f.*, 177
 Vitalian, Pope, 3, 155

WILFRID, 7
 Wini, 6

ZACHARY, Pope, 2, 139
 Zeno, Emperor, 28
 Zephyrinus, Pope, 93, 104
 Zonaras, 133
 Zosimus, Pope, 106

THE END

